DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 691 IR 010 176

TITLE Scholars' Access to Information: Public Responsibility/Private Initiative. Minutes of the Ninety-Ninth Meeting, October 29-30, 1981, Washington, D.C.

INSTITUTION Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE 82

NOTE 100p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Depository Libraries; *Federal Government; *Government Publications; *Government Role; *Information Dissemination; Information Needs; Information Services; *Information Sources; Librarians; Library Associations; Library Collections; Research Libraries

IDENTIFIERS *Access to Information; National Commission Libraries Information Science

ABSTRACT

This set of minutes from a semiannual meeting of the Association of Research Libraries includes two presentations: "Some Reflections on User Needs and the Information Transfer Process," a talk on government publications and the public's right to know by Joseph Morehead, and "A Commentary on the NCLIS Public Sector/Private Sector Task Force and Its Report," by Robert M. Hayes. Reactor panel comments on the two addresses reflecting views from government, libraries, and the information industry, are followed by a general discussion of the topics addressed and a set of reports from ARL executives and committees. Among the nine appendices to the minutes are the annual reports of the Committee on Interlibrary Loan, the Committee on ARL Statistics, the Membership Committee on Nonacademic Libraries, the ARL Task Force on Bibliographic Control, and the ARL Task Force on Collection Development. Also appended is a membership roster for the association as of 1981. (JL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED215691

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Scholars' Access to Information: Public Responsibility/ Private Initiative

Minutes of the Ninety-Ninth Meeting

October 29-30, 1981
Washington, D.C.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Mandel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

1982
Association of Research Libraries
Washington, D.C.

IR010176

Minutes of the meetings of the Association of Research Libraries are published semiannually by the Association, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Price: ARL Members: $15.00 per year, $7.50 an issue
Nonmembers: $25.00 per year, $12.50 an issue

Editor: Nicola Daval
Association of Research Libraries

Association of Research Libraries
Minutes of the meeting. 1st-
Dec. 1932-
[Princeton, N.J., etc.]
v. 28 cm.
Meetings are numbered irregularly: 9th-10th, 12th called respectively: 10th-11th, 13th.
INDEXES:
Subject index.

1st-42d, Dec. 1932-Jan. 1954. 1 v.

Z673.A84 59-30046

Library of Congress [ ]

Printed in U.S.A. ISSN 0044-9652

These Minutes are printed on a stable and enduring paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Opening	1
SOME REFLECTIONS ON USER NEEDS AND THE INFORMATION TRANSFER PROCESS	
Joseph Morehead	2
A COMMENTARY ON THE NCLIS PUBLIC SECTOR/PRIVATE SECTOR TASK FORCE AND ITS REPORT	
Robert M. Hayes	12
REACTOR PANEL: VIEWS FROM GOVERNMENT, LIBRARIES, AND THE INFORMATION INDUSTRY	
Remarks by Kenneth B. Allen	21
Remarks by Harold Schoolman	27
Remarks by Robert S. Willard	31
Remarks by Hugh C. Atkinson	36
Discussion	40
BUSINESS MEETING	
Election of Board Members	42
Report of the Executive Director (with comments by Ray Fry and Margaret Child)	42
Report of the Office of Management Studies (with comments by Pamela Darling)	49
Report of the Canadian Association of Research Libraries	52
Report of the ARL Committee on the Preservation of Research Library Materials	52
Report of the Network Advisory Committee	53
Report on the Eighteenth-Century Short Title Catalogue Project	55
Report of the Council on Library Resources	56
Report of the Committee on ARL Statistics	59
Report of the ARL Task Force on Bibliographic Control	59
Report on the CLR Bibliographic Services Development Program	60
Report of the ARL President	62
APPENDICES	
A. Executive Director's Report	67
B. Annual Report of the ARL Committee on Interlibrary Loan	72
C. Annual Report of the Committee on ARL Statistics	73

Page

D. Annual Report of the Membership Committee on Nonacademic Libraries 74

E. Annual Report of the ARL Task Force on Bibliographic Control 75

F. Annual Report of the ARL Task Force on Collection Development 76

G. Attendance at the 99th Membership Meeting 77
Member Institutions 77
Name Index for Members and Staff 81
Guests 84

H. Officers, Board of Directors, Committees, and Task Forces of the Association 85

I. Membership of the Association of Research Libraries 90

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Minutes of the 99th Meeting

Jay K. Lucker, Presiding

The Ninety-ninth Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries convened at the Capital Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., October 29-30, 1981.

President Jay K. Lucker opened the meeting by welcoming and introducing both the new and alternate representatives attending their first ARL meeting and the guests of the Association.

Mr. Lucker then turned the program over to Donald Koepp, who introduced the morning's program and speakers.

SOME REFLECTIONS ON USER NEEDS AND THE INFORMATION TRANSFER PROCESS

Joseph Morehead

State University of New York at Albany

MR. KOEPP (Princeton University): Thank you, Jay. The title of our program this morning is "Scholars' Access to Information: Public Responsibility/Private Initiative." We will focus on the implications for scholars and research libraries as the boundaries for the dissemination of information shift between public and private responsibility. Our speakers will, from their own perspectives, try to answer such questions as: Who decides what information will be available? How will this information be delivered? And to whom? In putting this program together, Program Coordinator Millicent Abell recognized the broad diversity of opinion on this subject and provided us with two speakers and a panel of four shorter presentations. We will have an opportunity at the close of these presentations for questions from the floor. The length of that period will be somewhat dependent upon the amount of time that we have left to us.

Our first speaker is Joseph Morehead, Associate Professor, School of Library and Information Science, State University of New York at Albany. He brings to this discussion a doctorate in library science from the University of California, Berkeley, a number of years of teaching, and a broad range of publications in the general field of government documents.

MR. MOREHEAD: Much has been written and spoken about the public's right to know. All the freedom of information laws that have been promulgated require governments to release previously withheld information upon request if justified and under appropriate limiting circumstances. But there is another right — the right to be informed. And this is made manifest by government policy toward the volume of public documents that are issued by or for the federal establishment, state and local entities, international bodies, etc. Thus, while the library community has always supported liberal open records legislation, its major interest properly lies in the broader arena of the production and dissemination of government publications for the benefit of the using public. For although my colleagues in documents librarianship are as disputatious as any other group, they are virtually unanimous in believing that democratic processes languish when government information is not made promptly and readily accessible.[1]

But if access to government information is such an obvious desideratum of a free society, why is there so much contention, so much debate, surrounding the issue? It seems to me that this is the crucial question that lies behind all the complaints and discussions that perennially arise whenever two or more documents librarians foregather. It is a problem I have long contemplated and addressed in my teaching and writing. This forum gives me an opportunity to try to articulate some of the issues or aspects of the problem that tend to generate controversy and misunderstanding.

Accountability

The first issue I would like to address concerns government accountability in the dissemination of information. In 1978, a survey of a number of departments and agencies of the Federal Government was conducted by the Congressional Research Service (CRS) of the Library of Congress at the request of members of the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs. The main purpose of the study was to determine the agencies' management of public affairs and public information programs through the issuing of government documents, but the CRS findings provided data of interest beyond that purpose.

Based on responses from 74 of the 80 agencies queried, approximately 102,000 government publications were issued in an 18-month period from January 1977 to June 1978. But during the same period, the Monthly Catalogue of United States Government Publications, our central bibliographic tool, recorded about 66,000 titles. This means that about 36,000 publications failed to reach the desks of the catalogers at the Government Printing Office's Library Division, which is, among other things, a violation of Section 1710 of Title 44, U.S. Code.

Another finding of the survey revealed that, of the 102,000 titles identified, at least 19,000 were distributed free of charge. This is a perfectly legal activity as long as the agencies comply with GPO Printing and Binding Regulations involving prior approval from the Joint Committee on Printing. But many of the titles distributed at no charge to educational institutions, conferences, exhibits, and individuals upon request are also sold on a subscription basis or as monographs, and this creates a situation of inequity.

One startling fact emerged from the survey. Most agencies keep no central file on publications and have no ability to determine accurately and promptly the extent of their publishing activities. The figure of 102,000 itself is but an estimate. As the survey noted, "it is imperative to remember that this number cannot be verified and is probably not comprehensive."[2] Similarly, the 19,000 free publications is a guess; agencies did not keep records of which of their publications were being distributed hither and yon.

Although we may surmise that some of those 36,000 publications not listed in the Monthly Catalog found their way into some libraries, nevertheless the absence of bibliographic verification is an obvious disaster for access. I have seen no follow up studies since this appeared as a Senate committee print in 1979. But one wonders how many thousands of government publications, some of which may be of profound value to the researcher, continue unlisted owing to sloppy and careless agency practices.

User Apathy

The struggle to increase access to the publications of governments has enjoyed success in at least one category: federal depository distribution policies. Thanks to an active Government Documents Round Table (GODORT) and a responsive Superintendent of Documents, more public documents than ever before are available in microform and hard cover. Despite the findings of that CRS survey, it seems that agencies, the Congress and the courts are complying with the several provisions of

Chapter 19, Title 44 of the U.S. Code concerning the depository library program. GPO officials, in testimony before a subcommittee on legislative branch appropriations for fiscal year 1982, projected "an increase in the number of titles distributed [to depository libraries] from the current level of 58,000 to a record total of 91,000 by the end of the fiscal year 1982."[3] With all these documents crowding the shelves of libraries, where are the users, eagerly awaiting the shipments, who will descend upon your institutions to glut their research needs? According to one well-received study, we have greatly overestimated patron use of federal and other government publications. The author of the study, Peter Hernon, analyzed the responses of almost 700 economists, historians, political scientists, and sociologists on the campuses of 17 medium to large academic institutions, all of whose libraries enjoyed good to substantial holdings of federal, state, and municipal documents. His findings indicated that an unexpectedly large number of the professors made infrequent use of the documents collections, and some made no use of them at all.

Various reasons were given for this lack of interest, but the overwhelming response was "that governments publish little or nothing of value in their immediate field."[4] Historians, Hernon found, were foremost in subscribing to that view. Now, since the institutions involved were located in the midwest (the author's study was a doctoral dissertation at Indiana University's graduate library school), some of you from other regions might be tempted to exclaim, "Ah, but this is not the case at Harvard (Yale, Duke, Stanford, etc.)." Yet we ignore the implications of the study at our peril. Academic librarians have always assumed, without systematic verification, that social scientists are frequent if not heavy users of their documents collections. After all, it is not an unreasonable supposition.

Faculty, it must be noted, did not altogether eschew government publications; they simply avoided the library's collections. Rather, they relied on secretaries, student assistants, commercially produced looseleaf services, personal subscriptions, documents sent to them by their congressman, and the like. One sociologist shunned the segregated documents collection in his library because he could not understand the arcane mysteries of the Superintendent of Documents classification scheme and was too embarrassed to ask.[5]

Infrequent use was also made of state and local documents by the social scientists in Hernon's study. Local documents were especially slighted, perhaps—the author speculates—because of the great lack of bibliographic control and unity within this vexing category. I should point out that the professors are not the sole villains of this study, unqualified creatures guilty of academic malpractice. Librarians, Hernon avers, could create a better atmosphere for research through increased user awareness, bibliographic instruction, and other didactic devices. Yet my visceral reaction to this study and from my own observations is that any number of professors rely too heavily on what their colleagues have written; that is, on secondary sources.

If Hernon's study is at all valid or reliable, it raises serious questions about the acquisitions policies of libraries that house and maintain public documents. For as you know, the burden of maintaining a large collection of documents in terms of personnel and space is not inconsiderable. Common sense would insist that our wonderful collections of hearings, laws, annual reports, treaties and other primary materials would draw scholars to them as iron filings to a magnet. But then,

common sense tells us that the earth is flat. That social scientists may not be the assiduous users we presupposed suggests a reassessment of management resources in our large research libraries.

Cost Versus Comfort

A third problem affecting the ease of access to government documents is one that continues to engender not only controversy among documents librarians but some acrimony and bad feelings. It involves the conversion of certain types of government publications to a microformat for shipment to federal depository libraries in that format only. It is, I fear, a trend that will increasingly cause user disaffection. It has already narrowed the choice of format for users, split collections, and created administrative problems the consequences of which libraries have not yet faced.

It all started innocently enough. In 1977, the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing gave the Public Printer official authority to "convert to microfiche, as necessary and as requested by individual depository libraries, that category of publications identified as 'non-GPO documentation' " and "to convert to microfiche, as necessary and as requested by individual depository libraries and when savings in cost are clearly demonstrable, that category of publications identified as 'GPO documentation' ".[6] This policy statement established two separate microform programs proceeding along parallel tracks. Non-GPO documentation refers to titles produced by agencies using their own printing facilities. Microform distribution of these titles saves the agency a great deal of money. This particular program was welcomed by the library community as a means of securing those publications that remained elusive so long as agencies had to supply them in hard copy. In this category, depository libraries electing to receive the item accepted the microform edition only.

The second track is somewhat more controversial. GPO documentation refers to those titles and categories printed at GPO or by contract with GOP. Whereas non-GPO titles consist of many publications that will be used by smaller groups—more specialized, technical documents—GPO documents are familiar to a much larger audience and comprise the standard reference works, most periodicals, working papers of the Congress, court reports, census data, laws, and the like. Moreover, they are titles that commercial microform publishers have been filming and selling to libraries for many years, and the controversy between the Information Industry Association and the former Public Printer concerning this matter is well documented. For GPO documentation, librarians began with a choice: they could receive the item in hard copy or microfiche. GPO officials at first pledged to proceed slowly in determining the categories of microfiche conversion of GPO documentation and to seek the guidance of the Depository Library Council, a representative group of librarians that was established in 1972 to advise the Public Printer on matters dealing with all aspects of federal documents policy.

But that pledge is wearing thin. A shibboleth has been introduced into official policy and it has political sanction. Note the recurring words and phrases in two quotations I am going to read. The first is from remarks made by the Superintendent of Documents in San Antonio in April of this year. The second statement was made by his deputy in June of this year here in Washington.

"Severe budget constraints could force us to convert to distribution in microform more rapidly than anticipated."

"Severe budget constraints are forcing the Government Printing Office to accelerate conversion of publications from expensive paper format to less expensive microform publication."[7]

This threat to accelerate was made manifest when documents librarians read the following decree on Daily Depository Shipping List No. 16, 085-M of June 16, 1981: "We will no longer distribute Congressional House and Senate bills in paper format. Beginning with the 6th microfiche bill shipment, all depositories previously receiving paper will begin to receive microfiche. Shipments containing paper bills will discontinue." Public bills and resolutions, with their amendments, had heretofore been a standard GPO category, and since April 1979, librarians had been offered a choice of formats. But now those who use depository libraries to research the language of legislation will have only the microform with which to work.

This decision, in my judgment, is particularly aggravating in that it appears to violate GPO's own standards. Just two weeks after that infamous Shipping List notification appeared, Jay Young, the Director of the Library and Statutory Distribution Service at GPO, was in San Francisco at ALA's Annual Conference suggesting guidelines for publications that would be acceptable for conversion to microfiche and those which ought to remain in hard copy for distribution to depository libraries. Concerning the latter, one such category read:

Publications which are updated by changes, transmittals, etc. These will not be fiched because they are intended to be interfiled and would be hard to use on fiche. Also the changes are usually small in size and would not be cost effective to fiche.

(Before I comment on this statement, I hope you are as dismayed as I to discover that "fiche" has become a verb. How can one have confidence in a government agency that would take such liberties with language? With profuse apologies to Shakespeare, I suppose the issue at hand is "to fiche or not to fiche.")

What GPO had in mind, of course, were the numerous manuals and other government materials published in loose leaf format. But this category also applies to bills and resolutions. Because the bill number is the key piece of bibliographic information, bills and their related parliamentary forms are easily filed by number in convenient cabinets. And they are easily retrieved by the several government-produced and commercially-available indexes. But now that bills are available only in microfiche, we will increasingly encounter a "scattering effect" inherent in the concurrent filming process. Grisly examples have already been reported by libraries that had earlier opted to receive bills in a microformat. For example, H.R.3919, the Windfall Profits Tax Bill of 1980, represented a total of 983 documents, including amendments, scattered among 66 fiche. And even on fiche which contain more than one document, the documents will often be found on scattered coordinates of the fiche.

Implicit in the guidelines that were promulgated at ALA last June was the understanding that all government publications that are heavily and frequently used would be spared the "microfiche only" verdict. I do not know about your

institutions, but the library that I am affiliated with records considerable traffic in this category. Moreover, there can be no consolation for libraries desiring to purchase the bills in paper copy. The latest edition of Price List 36 lists bills and resolutions available on subscription from the Superintendent of Documents for $8,200 per session of Congress, a prohibitive sum. And when bills were sent to depository libraries in paper copy, circulation priviledges were possible, for there is nothing in Chapter 19 of Title 44 that prohibits the circulation of government documents.

For me the most dismaying part of this sorry tale is that the GPO carried out this decision with the blessing of the members of the Depository Library Council. In their April 1981 meeting they recommended that GPO consider a fairly lengthy list of document categories for conversion to microfiche-only format, and heading this list was House and Senate public bills and resolutions.

I realize that I have belabored this one category like a Cassandra crying doom. But I fear that this misguided and feckless decision, abetted by the 15 librarians on the Council, signals the beginning of a policy that will metastasize throughout the entire system until, at some point, the only publication available in paper copy will be the Monthly Catalog. GPO is confident it can get away with this because: 1) it can simply invoke the sacred notions of cost effectiveness and demonstrable savings, and 2) enough librarians seem to believe that microform is the Preparation H of library economy, the medicinal balm that will shrink their problems. During the 1970s, GODORT and documents librarians generally operated in an adversary relationship with GPO, and the result was a decade of significant advances in bibliographic control and other neglected areas. But for librarians to countenance GPO microform mischief bodes ill for the 1980s.

Moreover, documents librarians know that bills do not place a burden on space needs, because they are permitted by law to discard them one year after the adjournment of Congress. To have a retrospective collection of bills in microform—as CIS, for example, has been doing for the last several years—is a splendid idea and allows for correct interfiling. But to provide current bills on microfiche only is bad policy. Unless your patrons are Caspar Milquetoasts, they will let you know of their displeasure in having to manipulate an inferior product after all these years of using the real thing. The dreadful irony is that the GPO and many librarians call this progress.

The War on Waste

Let me turn to a final aspect of this problem. When it comes to bestowing trust upon the federal government to honor the principle of access to information, the library community is clearly neither Republican nor Democrat. First, it was the Paperwork Reduction Act (Public Law 96-511), which was signed into law by outgoing President Jimmy Carter in December 1980. In July of that year, after the House had passed its version of the Act, the American Library Association sent a position statement to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, which was meeting to discuss the Senate companion bill, voicing concern about the potential for abuse implicit in the language of the act. Specifically, the statement expressed reservations about the role of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in its oversight function. "To have an entity which is typically

preoccupied by matters of cost and which is perceived as one of the government agencies least accessible to the public establishing policies regarding citizen access to government information requires some guarantee of balanced decision making regarding the collection, management, use, and dissemination of information."[9] (Emphasis added.)

Today, with a new Administration and, presumably, some new OMB employees, we have another perceived threat to access. And I want to emphasize the word "perceived." The basic documents associated with this perception seem at face value to be worthy expressions of common sense and good management. In a statement dated April 20, 1981, published in the Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, Mr. Reagan declared his war on waste by directing the heads of federal departments and agencies to impose a moratorium on the production and procurement of new audiovisual aids and government publications.

> "The Federal Government is spending too much money on public relations, publicity, and advertising. Much of this waste consists of unnecessary and expensive films, magazines, and pamphlets."

And the directive went on to say,

> "While we have a duty to keep the citizens of this country accurately and fully informed about government programs and activities, we should not use this as a license to produce films, pamphlets, and magazines that do not truly serve the public interest."[10]

The President's policy as enunciated was fleshed out in OMB Bulletin 81-16 dated April 21, 1981. The moratorium was to be specifically applied to "the development and printing of all new periodicals and new pamphlets, and the production, purchase, and lease or rental of all new audiovisual products." However, the OMB also directed the executive agencies to "conduct a comprehensive review of all existing periodicals, pamphlets, and audiovisual products and those planned for fiscal years 1981 and 1982 to identify and eliminate those that are duplicative and wasteful."[11] It is the latter statement, this component of the "war on waste," that troubles my colleagues in the library profession.

Incidentally, it is ironic to note that OMB bulletins are a category that is not available to designated depository libraries. Most libraries receive these valuable publications by subscribing to the Documents Expediting Project, which is located within the Library of Congress Exchange and Gift Division, for a fee.

Believe me when I say that virtually all documents librarians applaud any effort on the part of the administration to reduce the vast number of publications, usually of the pamphlet variety, that comprise what I have termed the didactic literature of government. For here is an area where it is very difficult, if not impossible, to separate utility from public relations, content from propaganda. Governments publish for many reasons, but one of them is to establish and validate their existence; that is to say, governments must be seen to exist, and every document that issues forth from press or mimeograph machine is a shout that says, "Here I am, you lucky people!"

With the hearty approval of academic librarians to spur their efforts, the agencies could save millions of dollars by eliminating publications like Cockroaches: How to Control Them, Bicycling for Everyone, The Pocket Guide to Babysitting, and their ilk. This is information which can be obtained elsewhere. Naturally, the issuing agency would point out that these pamphlets impart knowledge, instruct, help people. And that is true, if they contain accurate information (which we cannot always assume; witness, for example, the controversy over The Car Book, a guide for buying a car that has been the subject of not one but two editorials within the last eight months in the venerable, pompous New York Times). But the didactic nature of government publishing is a phenomenon of the late 19th and 20th centuries, and the philosophy of government as Big Teacher who knows best is too Orwellian for my taste.

If Shade Tree Pruning is a booklet that teaches while reminding us what a wonderful entity the Department of Agriculture is, Aunt Sammy's Radio Recipes represents a press agent's notion gone berserk. A collection of recipes from a popular radio show that aired from 1926 to 1934 (which few people remember any more), it was published by Agriculture in 1976 and has been kept in print. So I would say to OMB: By all means, get rid of your Aunt Sammy's and other trivial literature masquerading as essential to the mission of the agency so that GPO can concentrate on the dissemination of important documents. Perhaps, indeed, the savings thus effected will permit the repeal of the pernicious policy of converting bills and other significant documents into a format which compels clumsy and irritating retrieval for the harrassed user.

What many of my colleagues fear, however, is that in their zeal to cut costs, fuglemen and haruspices of the current administration will toss out the baby with the bath. We have already witnessed the discontinuation of Weekly Business Statistics, Monthly Department Store Sales, Climatological Data National Summary, Monthly Climatic Data for the World, Storm Data, and Housing and Urban Development Trends. These are periodicals which would seem to be as important to the public weal as Growing Raspberries. Each was terminated citing fiscal 1982 budget reductions. And librarians have greeted OMB Bulletin 81-23 (July 24, 1981) with some suspicion, because it provides instructions for eliminating, consolidating, reducing, or otherwise modifying recurring executive branch reports to the Congress. Many of these reports are incorporated into the bound volumes of the Serial Set, a significant series for researchers.[12]

If the Administration chooses the right targets in this war on unnecessary publishing, on the millions of dollars of films that agencies cannot even account for and on the myriad didactic pamphlets whose main purpose is agency self-aggrandizement, then we have nothing to fear concerning access to the substantive documents needed by users to remain informed about government policies and activities.

Conclusion

These issues, while ostensibly disparate, have in common elements that create a negative impact on scholarly access to government information. Agency accountability is an internal management problem that the federal bureaucracy must resolve. For their part, librarians must work more closely with their

colleagues in the academic disciplines in order to develop appropriate acquisitions policies for government publications. The elimination or reduction of pamphlets and brochures issued by agencies solely for public relations purposes can be accomplished by administrative fiat. Perhaps even the impulse to convert to microform every document in sight can be discouraged in those cases where ease of use is compromised.

But the dynamics of the information transfer process from government to library to user is clearly threatened by budgetary reductions. The United Nations, for example, in its attempt to limit the cost of documentation, now charges libraries a fee for the privilege of being a full or partial depository for its materials. And, to make matters worse, the United Nations Secretariat established distribution priorities for the documents and publications of the world body that place libraries at the bottom of a long list of more favored constituencies.[13]

I hope that the GPO is not contemplating such draconian measures. The federal depository library distribution program is estimated to cost $22,314,000 for fiscal year 1982, which is a minuscule sum to spend for the purpose of insuring the public's right to be informed.[14] This amount of money, it must be remembered, will cover the cost of supplying publications to only about 1,380 designated institutions. But all other libraries in our society must pay for government information at prices no longer competitive with commercial monographs and journals.

Although it seems more like Rubik's Cube in degree of frustration, the relationship between public policy and access to information may be perceived as triadic association, an often unholy trinity consisting of supplier, custodian, and user. As supplier, the GPO is concerned primarily with economies. If a policy is found to be cost effective, then it will be visited upon libraries regardless of user dissatisfaction. As custodian, the library community is frequently more concerned with policies that contribute to internal operational convenience at the expense of the convenience of its customers. And what of this last group, the maligned users? Unfortunately, they are often considered last. All they want is an agreeable confluence of those factors that permit the satisfaction of their needs; that is to say, a reasonable level of bibliographic accessibility, physical availability, and professional service.

If the goals of supplier and custodian were more nearly pro bono publico, fewer user complaints and indignities would be reported. Indeed, as we move into this uncertain decade with its emphasis on recision and retrenchment, we must strive to bring about a quality relationship between government and librarian for the lasting benefit of that user they both profess to serve.

References:

1. See Bernard M. Fry, Government Publications: Their Role in the National Program for Library and Information Services (Washington: Govt. Print. Off., 1978), p. 115.

2. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Governmental Affairs, Lack of Accountability in Government Public Information and Publishing Programs, Committee Print, 96th Cong., 1st Sess., May 21, 1979 (Washington: Govt. Print. Off., 1979), p. 85.

3. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations. Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1982, Part 2, Legislative Branch, Hearings, 97th Cong., 1st Sess., February 3, 1981 (Washington: Govt. Print. Off., 1981), p. 911.

4. Peter Hernon, Use of Government Publications by Social Scientists (Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corp., 1979), p. 40.

5. Ibid., pp. 41, 43.

6. Public Documents Highlights 21: 1 (April, 1977).

7. Public Documents Highlights 46: 1 4 (June, 1981).

8. Documents to the People 9: 218-19 (September, 1981).

9. Documents to the People 8: 235 (September, 1980).

10. Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, April 24, 1981, p. 447.

11. U.S. Office of Management and Budget. Bulletin No. 81-16, April 21, 1981, pp. 1-2.

12. U.S. Office of Management and Budget. Bulletin No. 81-23, July 24, 1981, p. 1.

13. "Sources of International Documentation: United Nations," Sources, Organization, Utilization of International Documentation, FID Publication 506 (International Federation for Documentation: The Hague, 1974), p. 198.

14. Supra, note 3, p. 869.

A COMMENTARY ON THE NCLIS PUBLIC SECTOR/PRIVATE SECTOR TASK FORCE AND ITS REPORT

Robert M. Hayes

University of California, Los Angeles

MR. KOEPP: Our second speaker, Robert M. Hayes, brings two careers to this discussion. For the 15 years prior to 1964, his experience was in government and industry, with such organizations as the National Bureau of Standards, Hughes Aircraft, National Cash Register, and Magnavox Research Laboratories. Since 1964 he has been associated with the UCLA Graduate School of Library and Information Science, for ten years as a professor in the school, and since 1974 as its Dean. For this program, the most important of his diverse activities external to UCLA is his responsibility as chairman of the Public Sector/Private Sector Task Force of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS).

MR. HAYES: I am delighted to be here. Before I go into my talk, though, I would like to take a brief commercial break.

As most of you know, the UCLA Graduate School of Library and Information Science received a grant from the Council on Library Resources to conduct a Senior Fellows program. I have sent a letter, which I hope each of you has received, asking for your help in identifying nominees for appointment as Senior Fellows for a six-week program at UCLA in August and early September of next year. I hope that you will regard this as a valuable contribution to our process of identifying potential candidates. I hope also that if you consider yourselves as appropriate potential candidates, you will not hesitate to nominate yourself or include yourself among the set of nominees. And that is the end of the commercial break.

The Public Sector/Private Sector Task Force was established by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science in response to what had been a continuing debate on the relative roles of the public sector, especially of the Federal Goverment, and the private sector. The focus of our work must be made clear, since the title of the task force does not adequately define that focus. In fact, we were concerned totally with what we called "governmentally distributed information," but really federally distributable information. We used that term instead of the rather ambiguous term "government information," a term with which we struggled during almost the entire two years of our discussions.

It is important to recognize what is not covered in the work that we did, so I would like to go through a list of the issues that were not considered.

1. We were asked in the original charge to consider the assignment of responsibilities for various functions in the information transfer process to the several components of society: government, private industry, and the not-for-profit sector. But we concluded that that was not the proper way in which to deal with the issues involved,

and that, in fact, assignment of responsibility for functions was totally inappropriate.

2. The implication of the charge was that we should consider government at all levels, but we did not. We focused our attention entirely on the Federal Government.

3. In considering even government or governmentally distributable information itself, we limited our attention solely to that involved in the external distribution of information, not to the internal use of information within government.

4. The task force concentrated totally on government information resources, products, and services that are in the realm of commerce: i.e., that are disseminated by the Federal Government either directly or through the private sector in a commercial manner, thus excluding those that are purely internal or administrative.

5. Although there clearly are areas of conflict within the private sector which are affected by government action (in the form of legislation, regulation, or even perhaps direct action), the task force did not consider such issues, focusing its attentions totally on the impact of governmental information activities. Thus, issues related to private copyright conflicts, to conflicts between different private information activities, and to conflicts between the providers and the purchasers of information services were not considered unless they involved the government itself as a party to those conflicts.

6. The charge implied that the task force should consider how present situations might differ from the views that we suggested, however, the task force concluded that it could only make progress if it limited its consideration to activities that might arise in the future. The extent to which existing situations may or may not fit the principles we identified will need to be considered on an ad hoc basis, case by case. We did not attempt to resolve current issues.

7. The area of international data flow is one in which public sector/private sector interaction is clearly of immense importance, but the task force did not feel that it had sufficient expertise in its membership or time with which to cover the issues adequately. As a result, despite the importance with which the members of the task force regarded questions related to international data flow, the task force did not cover any of them in its principles or its recommendations.

8. Although the issues related to technology pervaded the entire deliberations of the task force, arising in virtually every item of discussion, in the final analysis the decision was made that the task force did not find it appropriate to present any recommendations or conclusions about technology as such.

I think it is important to recognize those boundary conditions because many of those things we did not include might have been in your mind as being encompassed by the term public sector/private sector interaction.

I would like to comment briefly about the nature of the task force itself. It was selected initially and continued throughout its deliberations to maintain a balance among three sectors of our economy—government, private industry (i.e. for-profit organizations), and not-for-profit organizations. And basically the membership was almost evenly divided among those three components of our society. The distribution of philosophical views concerning the role of government covered literally the complete spectrum, from those who would claim that the government should do nothing in the area of information distribution, literally nothing, to those who would regard the distribution of information as an essential function of government and that government should be able to make decisions to distribute information if it is in the public interest to do so. Between those two polar views would be virtually any other view of the relationship between the public sector and the private sector of which you can conceive.

I would like to make a personal comment, which does not reflect the task force in any sense, but my own observation as chairman. The private sector members of the task force were very articulate, very forceful, and had a very firm grasp of what they wished to accomplish. The public sector and not-for-profit members of the task force were somewhat less forceful, less articulate, and less in agreement on the values related to their concern. I think that the results may reflect that relative degree of ability to articulate and present views forcefully.

The work of the task force can be summarized in two statements, the first of them representing a point of unanimous agreement. (Really, from the very beginning it provided a driving force our discussions and in achieving consensus within the task force.) The second represented the focus of the major philosophical division in the task force.

First, the point of agreement: it is an affirmation of the very context that led to establishing the task force in the first place. To quote from the report that we submitted to the National Commission:

> Information resources, products, and services are vital components of our society, of our economic productivity, of our governmental operation, of our individual growth and well-being. They are increasing in their value and importance, however their role may be measured. Government activity should be designed to foster the development and use of information resources and to eliminate impediments to such development and use.

As will be summarized later, most of the principles identified by the task force, but especially Principles 1, 2, 5, and 7, reflect this view. They are each intended to identify guidelines for federal policy that will support the development and use of information resources, products, and services.

Second, the focus of difference in philosophy and principle: there are basic differences in view concerning the proper role of the Federal Government or of government in general with respect to providing information resources, products,

and services. They result in conflicts between restricting and not restricting the role of government.

In the task force debate, those who would restrict the role of government would prefer to place reliance on the forces of the marketplace. Specifically, our society is founded on the traditional view that individual freedom and initiative expressed through competitive private enterprise are the best means for supplying the products and services needed by society and the best means for allocating resources. Government entry into the market place can have a chilling effect on private sector investment in the generation, collection, and distribution of information. When the government enters the marketplace it interferes with the ability of the market mechanism to allocate resources to the optimum production of goods and services. The private sector, if not threatened by the anticompetitive effect of government in the marketplace, can widen the distribution of information from government as well as from other activities and thus increase the availability of information.

In contrast, those who would favor not restricting the role of government will point to the following: there is need to assure equitable, open access to the public in general to information that has been generated, collected, processed, and/or distributed by taxpayer funds. To participate fully in our democratic society, citizens must be informed and aware, regardless of their individual ability to pay for needed information. Information needs that are not served by the marketplace must be met by government. The government has a role to play in stimulating the development of information as a resource for dealing with societal problems. The remaining principles, primarily Principles 3, 4, and 6, and most of the task force's recommendations are concerned with means for resolving conflicts implied by this major difference in philosophical view.

In the discussion there were a variety of identifiable bases for conflict. And although these were never formally identified during the discussion, they were implicit in the discussion. In the report we included a brief schematic (see p. 16) which brought together most of the identifiable bases for conflict.

I hope that you will recognize that any schematic is going to be inaccurate in many respects and can hardly convey the full depth of the task force's discussions. But it does, I think, provide a useful framework. The first three issues relate to the governmental aspects of the conflicts. In particular, the function of government determines the range of conflict or the point in the range of conflict. If the function is constitutionally defined—national defense, for example, is a constitutionally defined activity, copyright is a constitutionally defined activity—the range of conflict is likely to be limited. If it is congressionally mandated, we are likely to have a moderate conflict. If it is agency-determined, the conflict is likely to be very high. I am not going to repeat what you can read more fully in the report. But, once again, the purpose of the information and the degree of availability of the information also determine the extent to which there will be conflict about the proper role of government versus the private sector.

The next set of issues relate essentially to the user or the usage made of the information: the audience; the ability of that audience to pay; the social value of the information (medical information, for example, presumably having high social value); the economic utility (not necessarily synonomous with economic value); the

Table 1
Schematic of Contexts for Conflict Concerning the Role of the Federal Government in Providing Information Resources, Products, & Services

	Range of Conflict		
Context	**Limited**	**Moderate**	**High**
Function of Government	Constitutionally defined	Congressionally mandated	Agency determined
Purpose of Information	Internal work of government	Educate or inform public	Influence policy
Degree of Availability	"Freedom of Information Act"	Sup't of Documents	Heavily marketed
Audience	General public	Specific groups	Limited groups
Ability to Pay	Economically disadvantaged	General public	Business and industry
Social Value	High social value	Moderate social value	Low social value
Economic Utility	Low utility	Moderate utility	High utility
Immediacy of Value	Long-term value	Medium-term value	Immediate-term value
User Specificity	Resources	Products	Services
Amount of Value-added	Generation & processing	Compilation & collection	Packaging & direct services
Form of Availability	Print, Microform	Computer readable tapes	Online access, Broadcast
Pricing Policy	Congressional subsidy	Marginal cost of reproduction	Market based pricing
Existing Services	No overlap to minor overlap	Minor overlap to some overlap	Major overlap to competitive
Source of Information	Generated internally	Collected from public	Obtained from private sources

immediacy of value; and the extent to which the resources, products, and services are user-specific. This last issue was very crucial in the task force deliberations. As the government moves from creating information as a resource to distribution of it as a product, and then to providing tailored services, we are moving from highly generalized services to increasing specificity in the services.

The final set of bases for conflict relate to the processes by which the information is made available, represented in particular and for example by the amount of value added. If we are dealing simply with the generation of and processing of information, the conflict is likely to be limited. But as we move to compilation of information and collection of it from a variety of sources (including, in particular, private sector sources), the conflict increases. And as we move to the packaging of the information and providing direct services—in particular marketing them—the conflict becomes high.

The form of availability turns out to be a basis of conflict. If we are dealing with print or even with microform, the conflict, at least in the task force discussions, was fairly limited. But as we moved to computer-processable data, and more particularly to online access, the conflict became very, very great. Pricing policy and the existence of private sector services, either presently or potentially, were both sources of conflict. And, finally, and in many of the discussions most importantly, the source of the information represents a basis for conflict. If it is generated by the internal operations of government, there is limited conflict. If it is collected from the public, there may be moderate conflict, represented by the issue of what questions should be included in the census, for example. If it is obtained from private sources, the conflict is likely to be very high. This schematic gives you a very rapid picture of the kinds of issues with which we struggled.

Now let me turn to the findings of the task force, represented by a set of principles and, then, related recommendations. I am not going to go into the full detail of the recommendations, but I do want to give you the text of the principles. In general, they are quite consistent with each other and quite consistent with the set of objectives.

The first objective means that we were in favor of open access—and we used the words "open access" very carefully meaning without essential limitations on the availability, not "freely available," because that might imply at no cost—open access to information generated by the Federal Government and in favor of reliance upon libraries and private-sector organizations, both for profit and not-for-profit, to make readily available the information that can be distributed by the Federal Government.

The view of the task force is that these two sets of institutions, taken together, provide the best means for insuring public access to governmentally distributable information. On the one hand, the use of libraries, especially public and academic libraries, assures that ability to pay does not raise barriers which effectively and discriminatively deny access to information. On the other hand, the use of private-sector organizations, entrepreneurs in the business of providing information services, insures that individual freedom and initiative will be dedicated to developing and marketing a multiplicity of information services whose value is determined by the purchasers rather than by the government. The principles and recommendations emphasize the importance of using this balance—libraries and the

private sector entrepreneurs—as means for access, especially in contrast to creating new federal agencies to do so. The principles are in favor of a leadership role for government rather than a management role, and of limiting direct government intervention in the marketplace.

Now I would like to give you a very quick review of the principles; the related recommendations are spelled out in detail in the report.

Principle No. 1: The Federal Government should take a leadership role in creating a framework that would facilitate the development and foster the use of information products and services.

The recommendations related to this principle specify several areas in which government can provide leadership: enchancing the competitive forces of the marketplace; affirming the application of the First Amendment; providing legislative consistency; using efficient technologies; supporting education, reasearch, and data collection in this field.

Principle No. 2: The Federal Government should establish and enforce policies and procedures that encourage, and do not discourage, investment by the private sector in the development and use of information products and services.

The six recommendations presented as means for implementing this principle relate to encouragement of new developments, reducing uncertainties, and reducing risks, especially as may be represented by the threat of government entry into the marketplace.

Principle No. 3: "The Federal Government should not provide information products and services in commerce except when there are compelling reasons to do so, and then only when it protects the private sector's every opportunity to assume the functions commercially."

Principal 3 really gets to the core of the problem with which we were concerned, and I would like to comment on some words in this statement. "Compelling reasons" is obviously a content-free term. The issue, of course, was not what are compelling reasons, since, in fact, we had no means of coming to agreement on what is public good or not public good, what are reasons that government ought to provide or not provide information services. We used the term "compelling reason" rather than "public good" precisely to point out that we cannot answer that question. But it is answerable by a process, so the key point is that process by which the issue of "compelling reasons" can be resolved. The recommendations related to this principle outline a series of steps for determining that there indeed are "compelling reasons" for the government to provide services in commerce:

- Announce intentions, review and approve any plans before implementation; do so soon enough so that the nongovernmental activities have the opportunity to respond to them.

- Provide an "information impact and cost analysis" as part of the process of review, evaluation, and approval.

- Review periodically.

- Do not arbitrarily restrict the Federal Government from enhancement of information products and services.

- Conduct a periodic economic assessment of the impact of Federal Government information products and services.

The fourth principle is really directly related to the same set of issues.

Principle No. 4: The Federal Government, when it uses, reproduces, or distributes information available from the private sector as part of an information resource, product, or service, must assure that the property rights of the private-sector sources are adequately protected.

To me, Principles 5, 6, and 7 are perhaps the most important principles and recommendations.

Principle No. 5: The Federal Government should make governmentally distributable information openly available in readily reproduceable form without any constraints on subsequent use.

Principle No. 6: The Federal Government should set pricing policies for distributing information products and services that reflect the true cost of access and/or reproduction, any specific prices to be subject to review by an independent authority.

Of course, we recognized the problems in determining true cost, but they were problems which we were totally unprepared to resolve. That is an accounting problem, not a policy problem. The key point is that the prices for Federal Government information should not be set in terms of market-oriented criteria, should not be set in terms of making a profit or even paying for the costs of creating the information in the first place. They should be priced at a level that will encourage external use of the data.

Principle No. 7: The Federal Government should actively use existing mechanisms such as the libraries of the country as primary channels for making governmentally distributable information available to the public.

The recommendations related to these principles are presented in the report.

The report was submitted on August 8. (It actually was completed on August 1, but it took a couple of days for my home computer printer to do the printing, and so it was delivered to the National Commission on August 8.) We were scheduled to have a meeting last Friday, at which it would be formally presented to NCLIS, but

that meeting was deferred until January. I do not know what the current status is. I assume that if you want copies of the full report, you can get them from NCLIS.

I do have a couple of personal comments I would like to make. They represent concerns on my own part and I am going to take the opportunity of this forum to express these concerns. The first relates to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980. It gave to the Office of Management and Budget an extent of power over distribution of governmental information that, frankly, frightens me. And I want to record that with you. My comment is directly related to the issues with which the task force was concerned during its deliberations. We found in the Paperwork Reduction Act the embodiment of many of our recommendations. And so my concern is not with the substance of the Paperwork Reduction Act but with the extent of power that has been placed, essentially, in one agency, by it.

The second concern relates to the general approach that calls for the government to have "cost recovery," because the effect of that is, by the very nature of cost recovery, to put the government into the marketplace; that is where the real problems have arisen. When the government functions as though it were a private, entrepreneurial organization, in the marketplace for the purpose of making money, even if only for the purpose of cost recovery, I find that to be very distressing. What will happen is either to eliminate the availability of government information through government sources or to put the government into the competitive position that has been of such concern to the private sector, and properly of concern.

Thank you very much.

REACTOR PANEL: VIEWS FROM GOVERNMENT, LIBRARIES, AND THE INFORMATION INDUSTRY

MR. KOEPP: We now have four panelists, each of whom has roughly ten minutes, and at the end of that period we will have an opportunity for questions and dicussion with all six of our speakers.

Kenneth B. Allen

Office of Management and Budget

MR. KOEPP: Our first panelist is Kenneth B. Allen, a staff member of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Mr. Allen's responsibilities include the development and implementation of government policies and guidance regarding the management of information resources, with particular emphasis on information technology, information dissemination, and personal privacy. Mr. Allen has a B.A. in political science from the University of Illinois and an M.S. in governmental administration from George Washington University.

MR. ALLEN: In spite of the rousing endorsement we at OMB got from the last speaker, I do appreciate the opportunity to be here. If nothing else, I would hope that my appearance would provide some evidence that we are accessible, open-minded people who are trying to do what we think is best and willing to consider all points of view. I appreciate the opportunity to meet with those of you responsible for administering the nation's most prestigious libraries. The issue of access to government information is one with which we are both concerned.

As my contribution to today's program, I would like to identify some of the major issues which must be considered in developing federal policies on public access to information. In policy making, as in research, problem solving begins with a definition of terms and agreement on the scope of the problem. Unfortunately, too frequently we debate the issue of access to government information without having laid the proper foundation as to what the outer boundaries of the issue actually are.

What is "government information"?

The first issue is what is "government information?" There is a tendency in discussing public access to government information to use the term "government publication" as synonomous with government information. While much of the information available from the government is contained in reports, pamphlets, and similar publications, much more is not. Much of the information held by the government is contained in files, data bases, and similar media, not readily available for external access. Providing access to the latter information poses an entirely different set of problems from making available government publications.

A related issue is the types of information held by the government. Information available in brochures and other publications is often produced specifically for the purpose of communicating with the public, or some other audience. On the other hand, the government also has a great deal of information which is not specifically intended for the public. For example, to carry out government programs, almost every agency collects information from the public. Similarly, many agencies conduct research and produce scientific data. Every agency produces internal memoranda and similar types of information to carry out its day-to-day operations. Two years ago OMB proposed a draft policy which attempted to categorize the different types of information held by the Federal Government. We used the term "public information" to describe information produced by the government specifically for the purpose of informing or communicating with the public. The phrase "government information" encompassed that information which the government created or collected in the course of carrying out its responsibilities. Such information may or may not be available to the public. The Private/Public Sector Task Force chaired by Dr. Hayes spent a great deal of time discussing these categorizations. Their conclusions was that these definitions were too imprecise to be used as policy statements. We tend to agree. Our intent in offering the definitions was to stimulate debate and we apparently succeeded. Regardless of which definitions or categories are used, any discussion of public access to government information must recognize the different types of information held by the government.

Are there limits on the right of public access?

Most people would agree that public access to government information is the cornerstone of a democratic society. At the same time, such access is not unlimited. An analogy can be found in the constitutional right to free speech. While freedom of speech is a valued right in our society, it is not unlimited. You cannot yell "fire" in a crowded theatre. The same is true for access to government information.

Over the past decades we have established that certain types of information are not available to the public. The most obvious example is classified defense information, the release of which would be detrimental to our national security. We also have laws which protect the personal privacy of individuals by placing limits on how personal information may be used and to whom it may be released. The public's right of access does not extend to information which would infringe on the right to privacy. I am sure that few of you in this room would appreciate having your tax forms, or census forms, made available to the public. There are other types of information which are also frequently withheld from public access. For example, proprietary information held by the Federal Government about businesses is often withheld from public scrutiny. Similarly, information produced in the course of doing government business, such as internal advice and policy recommendations, is often withheld. I agree that the justification for withholding the latter types of information is not as clearcut as it is for personal or national security information. Many people would argue that information about the internal workings of government should not be withheld. I will not attempt to enter that debate, or resolve it. I bring it up only to indicate that the public's right to access government information is not unlimited. In many instances, the issue involves balancing the right of access with the needs of society.

It is important to note that the debate over the proper balance between public access and society's needs is a continuing one. For example, the Congress is now considering legislation which would modify the Freedom of Information Act. These amendments are in response to a perception that in some areas, the public's right to access government information may have been too broad. In another area, our society's growing reliance on information technology has raised new concerns about the protection of information. Many persons believe that unlimited public access to socio-economic information, such as the state of our financial markets, or the value of U.S. argicultural crops, could assist our adversaries in the international arena. As a result, it has been suggested by some that certain types of information which are not traditionally considered as classified data, should be, and therefore withheld from public access. I neither agree nor disagree with this position. It is mentioned solely to demonstrate the evolution and dynamics of the debate over public access to government information.

Unrestricted vs. free

A problem frequently encountered in discussing public access to government information is the tendency of many people to use the terms "unrestricted" and "free" interchangeably. They are not the same. Unrestricted, at least in my view, means unimpeded or available. Unrestricted information would be information to which the public can obtain access; the methodology of access and the price, if any, are irrelevant if the information is available. Information would be restricted if access is denied, for whatever reason. Free information, however, means without charge. Free information does not mean without cost. There are costs associated with providing access to information. If the information is free, or without charge, the costs have been shouldered by the society as a whole. If there is a charge, the individual is assuming at least a part of the cost of access. The most obvious example of the confusion between unrestricted and free is found in the use of the phrase "the free flow of information." This phrase is misleading to the extent that it implies information can be made available without cost. To the extent it refers to information as being unrestricted, or unimpeded, it is useful.

Information as a resource

A point made in the preceeding paragraph is worth highlighting. Most people now agree that information is a resource: it has both value and costs. There is no such thing as "free" information. Unfortunately, we have traditionally ignored the costs of federal information activities. As a result, we have made investment decisions regarding the allocation of information resources without regard to how efficient and effective those decisions are. Similarly, it is extremely difficult to measure the benefits of individuals information goods and services. This has important implications for public access to information. When federal information is made available without charge, the costs are borne by the society as a whole. When information is sold, the costs are borne by the immediate user. There are many instances when it is appropriate for the society to bear the costs of public access to government information. At the same time, there are many instances where it is not appropriate. Without the ability to identify the costs of providing access to information, it is difficult to make informed judgements about who should shoulder those costs.

I have to be careful here. When I start discussing the costs of information I can see the audience tense up and begin to snarl. The problem is that people equate the cost of information with the price of information. They are two separate issues. Identifying the costs of federal information activities does not necessarily mean that information will be sold. It means only that decision-makers will have additional data on which to base decisions regarding who should shoulder the costs of information activities. Identifying the costs of information is an economic issue. Establishing prices for government information is a political issue.

Access vs. dissemination

Two other words I often hear used interchangeably are "access" and "dissemination". To my mind, they are different concepts. Providing access to government information means that the information is available for the individual to obtain. The individual may have to seek it out, or go somewhere for it, but it is available. Dissemination, however, means that the government take active steps to make the information available. In such cases, the government does something to put the information in the hands of the intended audience. To put it another way, access, as an information transfer function, means an active role for the individuals and a passive role for the government. Dissemination, on the other hand, involves a passive role for the individual and an active role for the government. The distinction is important. Many people who argue for greater public access to government information are actually implying that the government has an obligation to disseminate the information.

Method of access

Another dimension to the issue of public access to government information is the way in which such access will be provided. Government information is currently available through a variety of mechanisms. For example, many agencies provide access to or disseminate their own information, either directly or through a government-wide mechanism such as the Superintendent of Documents and National Technical Information Service. A great deal of government information is also available through the federal depository library program. Finally, the private sector also plays a role in making government information available. Any discussion of public access to government information must include the various alternative mechanisms for making such information available. From a policy perspective, we must consider whether we have achieved the proper balance in using these different mechanisms. We recognize that no single method is universally desirable or appropriate. At the same time, we may not have achieved a proper balance. This is especially true with regards to the private sector. Over the past ten to fifteen years we have seen the emergence of a strong and viable information marketplace in this country. Increasing our reliance on this market to make government information available could increase private sector productivity, stimulate innovation, and free federal resources for other programs and activities.

Paperwork Reduction Act

Several times I have noted that we are dealing with the allocation of resources

when we consider the issue of public access to government information. Once that fact has been acknowledged, the next step is to ensure that those resources are managed efficiently and effectively. This is the central thesis of the recently enacted Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980. The primary objective of that legislation is to ensure that federal information resources get the same management attention accorded other federal resources.

While we are concerned with the total information life cycle, we have already taken one initiative aimed specifically at the dissemination of federal information. On September 11, 1981, OMB Director David Stockman requested each department and agency to review the information centers operated or sponsored by the agency. Among the criteria to be used in evaluating each center are the following:

- Does the center serve a legitimate and necessary government function?

- Does the information service duplicate similar services provided by other public or private organizations?

- Could the private sector provide the same or similar information services?

- Can the center be consolidated with similar services provided by other federal organizations?

- Is the information service provided on a full-cost recovery basis? If not, what are the benefits to the public or the government of providing the service at less than full cost?

It is not our intention to eliminate legitimate and necessary federal information centers. As Mr. Stockman noted in his memo to the agencies, many federal information centers serve a legitimate government function and provide benefits to many sectors of our society. He noted, for example, that the dissemination of research information fosters the application of scientific achievements to society's needs. Similarly, the development of an informed consumer public through the dissemination of accurate and timely information can sometimes provide an alternative to greater government regulation of the marketplace.

At the same time, we in the Federal Government have an obligation to ensure that federal information resources are being effectively and efficiently managed.

One final note. We are talking about the level of federal effort in information activities. I have noted that many people in the information arena respond to this issue as though they alone are being singled out for specific attention. That is not the case. You know as well as I that we are in a period of severe fiscal constraint. As a result, the role and level of government in all areas is being examined. Information is only one of many.

Regardless of what we do, decisions will be made regarding the allocation of resources to federal information activities. The choice before us is to attempt to develop some sort of coherent, rational process that will assist in making decisions about the level of effort in the information activities or to ignore the problem and accept the decisions that will occur, naturally.

I believe that the approach we should adopt, and I think it is consistent with what the Public/Private Sector Task Force and what Mr. Morehead said, is to try to provide some sort of rational analysis to support investment decisions in information activities. Improving the management of federal information activities will, I think, benefit everybody.

Thank you.

Harold Schoolman

National Library of Medicine

MR. KOEPP: Our second panelist is Dr. Harold M. Schoolman. I am not really certain that I know how to introduce a medical person to a largely academic audience. I am reminded of the story of the flight attendant who came on the intercom to ask if there was a doctor in the house and four professors of English came forward. Dr. Schoolman is that other kind of doctor and for a number of years he was a practicing physician. He has also taught in medical school and has occupied medical research positions. Since 1971 he has been associated with the National Library of Medicine (NLM), and since 1977 he has been Deputy Director for Research and Education of the NLM.

MR. SCHOOLMAN: After listening to Bob Hayes' wonderfully lucid explanation this morning, I am really tempted to simply say "Amen and three cheers." But in deference to my assignment, I will take seven or eight minutes to do so.

The issue of the private/public sector is certainly of extraordinary importance. The National Library of Medicine has been involved in this issue for many years, not only because of its professional interest and concern, but because people have a habit of suing us.

(Laughter)

Early on, we welcomed, even abetted, this suit because we believed the issue that, presumably, it was to address was of sufficient importance that it deserved to be aired and, we hoped, resolved. We learned after a great many years of substantial effort and labor that the judicial forum is a terrible place to discuss anything except the law.

(Laughter)

The Court of Claims finally came to the conclusion itself that this was a terrible place to discuss this business and it really should be taken up by the legislative process, where we discovered that that was an equally atrocious forum for the discussion—

(Laughter)

—of any public issue for which a solution was being sought. The point of this text is that unless this terribly important issue is resolved by the people who are fundamentally involved and concerned, it will end up in the judicial or legislative forum. And that would be a tragedy.

Up to now the discussion of the public/private interface has been a series of debates on some very parochial issues between two adversaries. What it did was to highlight their disagreement, to generate heat but no light. The monumental contribution of the NCLIS task force report is not so much in any specific

recommendation or any enunciation of principle, but rather to create the basis by means of which the discussion can proceed, not starting with the point on polarized disagreement but by seeking and going back to the points on which there can be common agreement.

It is to that point that we all are indebted to Bob's genius as chairman of this task force in finding the rhetoric—even if sometimes the rhetoric is obscure and ambiguous—

(Laughter)

—to find a basis of agreement from which this discussion can proceed. I do not want you to take that last statement as a pejorative point of view about the report. I think it is a necessary first step in the evolution of an informed, reasoned discussion that, one hopes, will lead to resolution of the issues and define the basis of our common agreement so that we can proceed from a point of agreement rather than yell at each other only about the things on which we disagree. In order to do that, it is frequently necessary to clothe some of our terminology in ambiguity, sometimes even to remove the primary issue one or two steps away so that we can be more comfortable in our discourse.

The task force was certainly perfectly aware of what they were doing. Indeed, it was their intent to find that common agreement which would constitute the basis for this productive discussion. And they make no bones about it. I call your attention to the fact that there are seven-and-a-half pages of definitions in this report. And, indeed, almost every definition is followed by an explanation of the definition.

(Laughter)

And so every time they could not agree upon language, they used a definition, which if not satisfactory, was amended with dependent clauses until they could get everybody to agree. I think it is a perfect legitimate, understandable and welcome contribution.

The point, however, is that the fundamental basis and purpose of this report should not be distorted into an argument about an individual recommendation or an individual principle. One must read the entire task force report; one cannot limit himself to simply glancing at the principles and the recommendations. One must recognize that the essence of the conflict and misunderstanding, the essence of the difficulty in arriving at a resolution, is elucidated in the seven-and-a-half pages of definitions, in the discussions of the individual principles and recommendations, and it is not very important whether you agree or disagree with any individual recommendation. What is important is that it provides a basis for intelligent discourse to find a new and workable solution to these difficult problems.

In addition to this necessary ambiguity of language, there is some transposition of problem. I think that all of us recognize, as the task force did, the tremendous importance of information in our society to individual well-being, to our economy, to the preservation of the freedoms that we hold dear. There seems to be no difficulty, as Bob pointed out, in arriving at that agreement.

Traditionally and historically and I think today most of us agree, in order to assure the widest possible dissemination of products or services at the least cost, our first choice would be to operate in the free market. We have historical theory and we have historical precedent, however, which suggests that there are times that in spite of that wise decision, the free market fails to meet our needs. On the basis of our experience in industry and agriculture, we recognize that when the free market fails to meet those needs, the government has both a right and, indeed, a responsibility to step in and attempt to rectify the market imbalances. It has in industry and agriculture attempted to do that by two devices: regulation and subsidization. There are many reasons that nobody likes regulation. And there are many problems with subsidization. But, nevertheless, those have been the mechanisms by which we have attempted to correct marketplace inadequacies.

In industry and agriculture, the government has rarely operated anything. The government does not build or manufacture anything, the government does not grow crops. So in point of fact the issue of operation as a means of adjusting the market imbalance has not usually been an issue in those traditional places. Where we have used government intervention in the free market, it has always been through subsidization or regulation.

Historically in the field of information, the situation is quite different. Information is the government's business. Aside from the question of personal and common defense, that is what the government is all about—information. Historically, it has not been the private sector but the government who have been the creators and operators of information systems. Our own Index Medicus is in its second century of operation, and it is far from the oldest of government data bases. The issue becomes polarized as to whether operation is a legitimate additional means by which government can attempt to rectify the market imbalance. The question of operation becomes a very, very sticky one, because, as has been pointed out, the issue of operation puts the government in some sense in commerce, and here the task force report is remarkably lucid in its ambiguity.

(Laughter)

It says, in defining "in commerce," that when one engages in activities such as marketing, etc., which have as their purpose the charging of a fee for the service, that is in commerce. I have forgotten the exact words, Bob. The very next sentence goes on to say: However, the government may engage in this activity without the intent of trying to recover money and yet it is still in commerce. It is a remarkably lucid point that operation per se places the government in a position where, indeed, it has the appearance of being in commerce and therefore stimulates the concern about unfair competition with the private sector.

I was delighted to hear Ken Allen say that he is not an advocate of wide sweeping application of principles but rather that there always need to be individual judgements made. The most dangerous of all universal principles that keeps coming up in this country and has already become more prominent in other countries in Western Europe is the notion that information products and services must survive the test of the marketplace. That principle, generically applied, would mean that libraries would have to recover their full cost of operation from the sale of their products and services. It would mean that the availability of information would be determined by its economic viability and it would mean that the price

of information would be set by what the market could bear, which is determined by those most capable of paying for it.

That intrinsic and terrible danger is inimicable to all that we hold dear in scholarship. It is the basic threat that needs to be guarded against. The question arises as to how much you can compromise this point. Is it possible to be a little bit pregnant? How long and how much can you tolerate and where do you draw the line?

I think that the lines can and will be drawn if we can start from a position of agreement that has been made possible by the NCLIS task force report if we can as people of goodwill, regardless of which of the three sectors we operate in, start from a common basis of understanding and with a general recognition of what our ultimate objective is, I think that we can resolve these problems before they get into the entangled mess of either judicial or legislative forums. And I think it is terribly important that we do so. My optimism about this is increased by the fact that here is this report which has not yet been issued and it is already the subject of one such beginning of that dialogue.

So now I do say to Bob Hayes' marvelously lucid presentation, "Amen and three cheers."

-30-

Robert S. Willard

Information Industry Association

MR. KOEPP: Our third panelist is Robert S. Willard, Vice President, Government Relations, of the Information Industry Association (IIA). For those of you who do not know, IIA is a trade association representing over 130 firms engaged in commercial creation, distribution, and marketing of information products and services. He is responsible for advancing the industry position on information policy issues for the Congress and within the executive agencies. Mr. Willard has an M.S.A. in operations research and systems analysis from George Washington University. His other degree is one which we agreed last night is probably relevant to his appearance here—a B.S.F.S. in international relations from the Georgetown School of Foreign Service.

MR. WILLARD: Good morning. It is a pleasure to be here. When asked to participate in this, I welcomed it—a little bit. We have a major conference starting next Monday in Boston and when the staff found out that I would not be around to help with those last minute details, I was persona non grata on the staff. But I welcomed the invitation because it gives me an opportunity to respond to some points on a subject that is of great concern to the information industry.

I apologize for the disjointed presentation that will follow. A reactor has the opportunity to do just that, react. I would like to cover a number of points that occurred to me as I was listening to the presentations and the first two reactions.

First of all, I think it is clear to any of you who know the background of the Information Industry Association that I do not include in my vocabulary of naughty words the word "fee." I believe fees for services are an important mechanism; in fact, it is a belief in the marketplace mechanism that we use as the basis for our philosophical approach to problems. There was a speech given, a few years back, by the then Assistant Attorney General who was responsible for antitrust activity, in which he looked at the whole question of government enterprises (and they do go beyond just information). He pointed out that government, with its unlimited—although this certainly changing—access to funds, can afford to subsidize activities and therefore can distort the signals that pricing decisions provide to the marketplace. Pricing, for example, signals to manufacturers whether they should invest in certain things.

Dollars clearly are a mechanism for expressing choice. And choice is what it is all about. Joe Morehead mentioned in his presentation that certain items probably should be discontinued and that others are more important and have been discontinued but should not have been. How is that choice made? Is it Joe Morehead's decision or Bob Willard's decision that cockroaches are a bad subject for a government publication and labor statistics are not? The market mechanism does help sort that out. If people are willing to pay, either directly or indirectly through public institutions, for access to that material, then it does have a value.

And let me refer also to Dr. Schoolman's assertion that some people say all information must meet the test of the marketplace. I would be the last to argue for that position. But we maintain that the first test should be the marketplace, and

only when marketplace failures occur does the role for the government arise.

How do you let the government make a decision? We have political mechanisms for that. Again referring to Joe's speech, he talked about the depository librarians who sit on the Depository Library Council assenting to a decision about making publications available on microform. As many of you know, that issue has affected our industry for many years. But on the particular aspect that he was talking about, that is, the ability of users to get maximum value out of the product that the Congress puts out in terms of bills and resolutions (which is a product that I am extremely familiar with, having to rely on that for doing what I do), I would agree with him completely that making it available in a microform format that is difficult to use was probably a bad decision. And he said the depository librarians on the council agreed with that. However, it was a political decision in the positive sense of that word: "political decision," the people expressing a decision.

IIA suggested, by the way, at the nomination hearings for the Public Printer, who heads the Government Printing Office (GPO) and the depository libraries program, that perhaps the Depository Library Council should be expanded to include not just depository librarians who are concerned about the mechanical and the backroom activities and so on, but perhaps also users of government documents. That might enrich the decision, the political decision-making process that takes place on how the depository library program is supported.

The question of decision making prompted in my mind some experiences we have had recently that show the dimension of the problem. When you look back at the history of GPO's conversion to microfilm, the industry, the Information Industry Association, has been supportive of that. We have Board of Directors resolutions encouraging the conversion to microfilm. And while I doubt that there is a single person in this room who would prefer to use microfilm over just about any other format for accessing information, it still has a number of advantages. A number of our member companies make a very good living from organizing information in that format, and we would like to encourage the use. Where our problem has arisen is in the decision-making process that took place. Of the whole range of products that could have been converted to microfilm in a timed fashion, the ones that were chosen first were the ones where private sector investment had already been directed, where good bibliographic control had been maintained through private sector investment. And now, that is the market that is being attacked first, while many other titles that are available right now simply in hard copy are not being converted by GPO and nobody in the private sector is touching those either.

We see this same approach happening where the government has decided to offer an information service for which the market has already been developed. This is an 180 degree turn from what I indicated in the first place, i.e. when there is a marketplace failure, there is a role for government. What we are seeing is that when the marketplace has been proven, the government says, "Why don't we do that?" For example, the Department of Labor has a file, referred to as Labstat, which is all the statistical data that they maintain on national accounts. They proposed to offer that online—not simply to offer it online, but to also offer the complete processing of that data coupled with users data. So if you were running a firm, you could input your historical data and compare it to the U.S. national accounts historical data and make decisions based on that processing. However,

that processing is already being done by a handful of companies out in the private sector, so this is exactly the wrong target for the government to go after.

The justification for such action is one that we see over and over again. It is one that I have difficulty with even conceptualizing, much less articulating. And that is that with the introduction of modern information technologies, e.g., the computer and telecommunications, there is not simply a quantitative difference to the ability to process information but also a qualitative difference. The ability to reuse, repackage, reshape information has completely changed as a result of having this high-powered technology available. The end result is that the marginal cost for additional activities is quite small. If the government says "We have to accumulate this information; we have to process it for our own use and for our own policy-making decisions," the next step, the incremental step to saying, "Why don't we set up a business or commercial operation that will help cover some of the costs, that will provide greater access to this information," essentially moves them into the business of information.

As I say, it is a difficult concept to come to grips with, and I have not satisfactorily handled it myself yet. But I think somehow we have to recognize that when that next step is made, the government has changed from its traditional role of handling information and performing governmental duties based on its requirement to handle information and has started a new operation.

I warned you ahead of time that this was somewhat random. Let me just make an observation that we also have traditionally and consistently at IIA supported the concept of depository libraries. Talking with the Public Printer just in the past week or two, he shared with me some of his concerns about how he is faced with the problem of reduced expenditures and yet retains the requirement to make information available. And he said he strongly supports the depository library program, that it is a mechanism for allowing access to information. But why 1200 depository libraries, or 1500, or 300? Dr. Schoolman talked about the inappropriateness of judicial and political mechanisms. The assignment of depository libraries is quite political. It was simply two per congressional district, plus two per state. Is that an arbitrary assignment of mechanisms for distribution of information?

Joe also talked about the price of government information to non-depository libraries. And I would suggest that there may be mechanisms, again going the political route, to provide subsidized pricing for those libraries which are not depositories to get access at a different rate than that at which most of the material is made available. But that subsidization is already taking place to an extent. A library in a profit-making area, if it wanted to buy a government document, would have to pay the full cost. Other libraries can buy it, but they have tremendous tax advantages. Being nonprofit, they do not have to be concerned about that additional cost that every dollar they use has appended to it.

And this also prompted something with which I will conclude, that is, the fact that the government is involved in everything, in almost every financial decision any institution makes. For example, the 1981 Tax Act. People do not even know the full ramifications of the new tax law, but it has probably made new tax provisions so that private sector companies when they are developing information products will be able to defer or completely eliminate taxes they would normally have to pay in

order to develop a product. This is clearly an indirect subsidy and it meets a public need and has been developed through political processes. The Tax Act also allows, for the first time, for people to deduct contributions to charitable and educational institutions, even if they do not normally itemize their deductions. So this has allowed those of you in the audience to go to a much broader constituency to get financial help. That financial help is coming from the government in a sense in terms of what they call tax revenues. These are taxes that would have been paid but now, instead of coming into the coffers of the Treasury, are going directly to the public good. I, as a donor, can say, "Rather than giving so much money to the government, I am going to give to a charitable institution; part of the money to come out of my pocket and part to come out of the money that would have gone to the government. It is an injection of a marketplace mechanism into this decision making.

Let me turn now to two personal concerns that Bob Hayes expressed. And I think I might echo a little bit of what Ken Allen said with regard to the Paperwork Reduction Act. (I have finally come to call it that. For the first six months or so I always called it the "so-called Paperwork Reduction Act"—

(Laughter)

—because, and I think Ken would be the first to admit that, the paperwork that OMB is now handling as a result of that Act has probably increased tenfold.) But my criticisms of the name is more because the law is a fundamental information policy statement that has been masked in a misleading name.

I do not share Bob's fears, except to be sensitive to them, that OMB is going to become a monolithic information czar. I commend the approach they have taken so far. It was a concept that was developed out of the data processing reorganization process, something called earned autonomy, that let the agencies set their own policies and prove that they can set their own policies that meet their own needs rather than a universal regulation being applied by OMB. Now eternal vigilance, etc. We have to monitor OMB. But I do not think it is an immediate concern.

The other thing Bob talked about was the emphasis on full cost recovery. And this is something that we have strongly advocated while all the time recognizing its difficulties. We, for example, have supported legislation that would require the National Library of Medicine to price its products and services at the full cost that is involved to get that product and service to the user while also recognizing that there are certain categories of users who meet the public good and therefore should be subsidized; less than full-cost pricing could be allowed in their circumstances—to wit, universities and medical schools and governmental units. This is not an easy thing to implement, because it is so difficult to ascribe costs to the information process: the collection, the organizing, the retention, the distribution. But yet I think it is important if we are to assure fair rules of the marketplace. If you do not know what something costs you to make it available to a user, how can you be sure that the actions you are taking will not unfairly impact on other people's ability to offer similar services?

Let me also quickly mention a related point. This links a little bit with what I said earlier about the intrinsic nature of the qualitative vs. quantitative difference in services, once you inject information technology. The argument is made that the

government has historically collected information and therefore it should continue. But history is simply that. And "times, they are a-changing." We can point to history. We could say, for example, that Dun & Bradstreet has been collecting business information since—well, they hired Abraham Lincoln as one of their reporters. So the private sector has been collecting information and marketing it for a long time also.

But it is with the change in our economy that has been chronicled by people like Mark Porat that show it is taking less manpower to produce the agricultural goods we need, less manpower to produce the manufacturing goods we need, that the manpower involved in proving general services we need is about stable, and yet there is this growing curve of information business that is taking place. The history is changing and the rules need to be looked at and re-examined. And that is why something like the report that NCLIS and Bob Hayes prepared is extremely significant, because it says: "Here are some rules for the marketplace, some rules for government activity in the information business, and let us start looking at them."

Charles Benton, the Chairman of NCLIS, has talked about the task of the task force quite frequently as something that really will never be complete. It is insoluble, just as much as deciding whether monetary policy or fiscal policy is a better way to get a handle on our economy. There is a continuing tension between ways of accomplishing the objective, which we all support, of increasing access to information.

We very much support the NCLIS task force report. We think it is a good starting point for the political mechanism now to look at this report. The participants represented the broad spectrum of concerned persons, and now the political process can take their product and start to involve it in the policy making of this country.

Let me conclude by using an analogy that we have talked about quite often. Information people, I think, are overdependent on analogies, but I will continue in that style. The anology is the idea of a three-legged stool. We very strongly view the mechanism that meets the information needs of this country as being just that. The three legs are the government, the not-for-profit sector, and the for-profit sector. If you weaken any of those, you run the risk that the mechanism will no longer fulfill its function. We are committed strongly to a healthy information structure in this country that involves all three legs of that stool.

Thank you.

Hugh C. Atkinson

University of Illinois

MR. KOEPP: Our fourth panelist is Hugh Atkinson, University Librarian at the University of Illinois, who certainly needs no general introduction to this group but who probably needs our sympathy as the final speaker having to find something that nobody else has said. Over the past ten years Hugh has represented two ARL institutions and has always been reliably direct in coherently expressing himself, and I have every sense he will do so today.

MR. ATKINSON: One of the things I would like to start off by saying is that I think that the best part of the NCLIS task force report is the opposition to that national information policy and agency. One of the things that I said at another forum was that we have had a national information policy before—it was called the Alien Seditions Acts.

(Laughter)

And that is just that attitude that we are talking about. In fact, governments tend to repress information, not distribute it. A restrictive information policy is the natural position of governments, just as with library directors, I might also point out. Very few of us have open salary listing and few are willing to submit all activities to public scrutiny. But, nevertheless, we know it is the nature of our own bureaucracies and certainly the bureaucracies even more important than ourselves—our institutions, our states, and the Federal Government—not to distribute information but to keep it secret and not use it. I would suggest that the drive for a national information policy is a most dangerous trend, and the opposition to that policy by NCLIS is commendable.

I also really have to take issue with Joe Morehead on the question of the depositories. After all, the issue surrounding whether the Government Printing Office (GPO) should suppress the didactic pamphlet in favor of some other forms is part of that information policy. One of the things that I would like to point out is that one of the reasons he gave for suppressing the didactic pamphlet was that the information was already available, that the pamphlet was just easier. I find that difficult to reconcile with the complaint about ease in using the microfiche.

Nevertheless, I believe that all of us in every library are searching for more economical ways of both storage and retrieval. Most of our patrons, by the way, are accepting slowly and reluctantly a somewhat uneasy use of the microfiche. We have done it with newspapers, we have certainly done it with a whole range of ERIC documents and the like, and we are doing it now with government documents. I believe that this is one place where our patrons are willing to trade ease for coverage.

The issues that Joe grouped under the right to be informed and accountability really are concerned with bibliographic control, an issue that this organization and all of us have gone on record over and over again as supporting most firmly. This is the ability to identify, enumerate, and describe the publications, in whatever form,

emanating from the government. We have a fundamental issue of bibliographic control, rather than, I think, accountability.

In reference to the NCLIS task force report, since I come from a land grant institution where I have seen the partnership between the private sector and the public work out quite well, I do not respond unfavorably to such a partnership. Illinois farmers actually do get an average of 150 bushels an acre in corn—in some cases, over 300 bushels—because of the partnership between the land grant agricultural institutions and agribusiness. Between our corn geneticists and DeKalb seed corn, there is a very real partnership that is similar, I would hope, to some of the things envisaged by the report.

However, I also want to point out to Hack Schoolman that there are other places where the government has really operated effectively. One of them is medical research. After all, the network of Veterans Administration and military hospitals has performed some of the most fundamental medical research, and that is an operational activity. Certainly the Federal Government is operating in transportation, through the airports, railways, and waterways, and has been operating in recreation through the parks system. Thus the government does operational things that the private sector does not do.

I think that the lack found in the task force report was of what I consider a statement of the fundamental responsibility of the federal agency to the general public. There should be a method of providing a safety net underneath the general public's, not the academic world's, need for information; some way of ensuring that the small public library, more likely to be an inner city branch, wherein we could guarantee that a concerned citizen would be able to find out what he or she needs to know to make an intelligent decision. This is not research, but basic survival, and that is the aspect I believe is missing from the task force's report.

If the report were adopted and made into policy tomorrow, the practical effect for us would be a slight rise in the costs of our indexes and abstracts. That is really what I believe the only practical effect now and for the next decade would be. Now, those of us who are paying that notable nonprofit organization, Chemical Abstracts Services—

(Laughter)

—the price of its index, and seeing that price rise, along with other index prices probably can live with it. I am not sure how long we can, but I do not think there will be a disaster for our individual budgets and our individual managerial functions very quickly. We are research libraries and in that we have to recognize that the materials we provide and the materials our patrons read and analyze are the least marketable of all forms of information. What distinguishes us as a research library community from the public libraries and from the instructional colleges is the storage of little-used material—information that is unlikely to find a ready market. This is an area where we are not going to recover costs; it is, in fact, a losing proposition on the individual item, but a very high gain on the total of what the research provides. It is in this role, it seems to me, that research libraries are going to have some very serious problems with the implementation of the recommendations of the report. On the surface these recommendations are perfectly logical. However, the people who read them and implement them may not

read into them the appropriate safeguards and problems for the research library community.

No matter how hard the task force tried, as you read through the report over and over again, and even though they have referred to nontraditional media, most of the examples are from either traditional media or straight-forward computer-based services: Index Medicus, MEDLINE, or the government publications themselves. No matter how hard the task force tried, it inevitably formulated both the principles and the recommendations of the basis of known activity, i.e. with traditional media. The concern that Bob Hayes talked about a moment ago, the change in quality when you change the technology, is truly there, but not as clearly addressed in the report as the task force intended.

Let us think about that for a moment or two as I get to the last of my four minutes. I can predict that most of that information medium will be in a combination of computers and video disc or some other form of visual storage in highly reduced form, randomly accessed. The little experience that we have had with aggregate data is almost completely with census data. Now, remember that we can talk about the computer-based products like MEDLINE and so forth, but by and large these are self-explanatory. They are alphabetical or relatively stably formed with subject headings as it is traditional printed material. It is relatively easy to figure out how to use them, even though it may take a half-an-hour search by a trained operator in a reference department. Still, that is a relatively uncomplicated search, which we all provide through BRS, Lockheed, and CDC—profit-making firms, I might point out, although Lockheed's was not very big—

(Laughter)

—and it did have some government intervention; nevertheless, most of us are in that earlier-referred-to partnership already.

There has been some effort on the part of Dun & Bradstreet and a few, just a few, business data firms, to deal with some, and just some, of the statistical and economic statistical data. Such is used in a very highly targeted audience: basically, the stock market and a few investment firms. That is where the basic kinds of aggregate economic data have been done. We do know that the census data, which are produced by a federal agency, is our best model, and perhaps the voting records, which are not produced by the government but nevertheless have the attributes of much of this kind of information, are the ones with which we have at least passing acquaintance with.

The University of Florida and the Georgia Institute of Technology are the only two institutions that I know of that made a relative, even a relative, success at using that data in any kind of massive way. First of all, the numbers of uses are very low. We are in that same old position we always are in when we collect German poetry or Italian history or American sociology:—

(Laughter)

—the number of items used compared to the number of items stored and indexed is very, very low. And the number of people who will use the census data and use it well is extraordinarily small on every campus. And, in fact, it is so small

that even statewide agencies have a hard time breaking even. And these are the most-likely-to-be-used data of all kinds.

It is when you start to get into such things as the fatigue of certain kinds of stressed metals and other kinds of aggregate data, that there is simply not going to be a big enough market. Now, I may not be absolutely right, but I will be very close, knowing the kinds of research that just go on now.

The problems of the potential market are even greater when we examine economic data and data such as daily reports about how much petroleum is stored. Some of that is clearly volatile political information, e.g. how much natural gas was stored in Texas, how much petroleum was available during the last severe energy crisis. I do not think you can minimize the political sensibilities. I just think you have to live with them. My advice to the feds is that it is better to live with the danger, because the suppressing or the not making it available is an even worse danger both politically and socially.

The ability to provide the necessary mechanisms to use such data that is beyond the comprehension and beyond the ability of most of us. As libraries and as institutions we need to provide the statistical packages, the computer time, the analysis of the data, the recognition of the data, and the indexing of the data. About 30 percent of the needed work has been taken in by the government's own processing of that information. It does not appear out of nowhere, it is processed. It is clear to me that the only reasonable next step to provide such a research tool, as public information, is to have the federal agencies continue that process and to make available that first 30 percent and add to it as a public service, not on a fee basis, but as a public service, the next 70 percent of the analysis.

It is in the area of the video disc, the new data, the new technology, where both the quantity and quality of that data will change, by virtue of its form and its presentation, that those of us in research libraries have most to worry about in the public information policy.

Thank you.

DISCUSSION

MR. KOEPP: We have a limited period of time for questions. I think any of the speakers would be happy to respond.

MR. HAYES: May I respond to some of the comments that were made? There are a number of comments I would like to make and I will try to make this brief. First of all, I have a plea. And, Hugh, it was triggered by your comments. Please stop using the term "littled-used material". I beg you. Say "little-circulated material". I buy that. But little used, I do not; let us find a substitute for it—please, I urge you. And please stop using the word "browsing" for the other kind of use.

Regarding the task force report, media other than the traditional printed and microform media were central to the issue with which we were concerned, and if you got the impression from the report that they were not, then we failed. But in particular, online services provided by the federal government were perhaps the most crucial concern that the private sector participants had in the discussion. At least, it was the one that most exemplified the problems.

You commented on the missing piece being the safety net. And if you got the impression that that was missing, again the report failed badly. We regarded the public library or the library community in general as the safety net for assuring that there was access to information, whatever the ability to pay was. I just wanted to make sure that that is made clear.

I would like to make several additional comments. There was in the report something that to me was one of the most important and one of the most exciting occurrences in the debate. It is the affirmation or, if you will, reaffirmation of the importance of the Freedom of Information Act and of the importance of applying the First Amendment in terms of freedom of the press broadly to encompass information activities of all kinds. I heard what you said about the possibility that other information which currently is not identified as security classifiable may be made so, and I shudder. If any effort is made to expand the scope of information that will not be made available to the public, we suffer; that is, the country suffers. The one thing we have is free flow of information and if we restrict that, we do not—they are going to get the information. It is we who will not get it. And that is the scary thing to me.

My final comment is really an effort to synthesize several things that were said, but I hope in an important way. We comment on the role of market forces as a means of allocation of resources, and to me they are beautiful. They function well, they permit the individual to make his individual decision about what is important and, by paying for it, to determine how resources will be allocated. There is no question in my mind about the value of the market forces as a means of allocation of resources. But, they are not the only means for allocation of resources. It is important to recognize that the political process is a complementary process to the forces of the market place, not secondary, as you would imply, but complementary. There are areas in which resources must be allocated which cannot be governed by the forces of the market place. It is not a matter of market failure, it is a matter of the nature of the decisions that are made, and essentially these are social

decisions. A transportation network is not built as a result of market forces. It is built as a result of a political decision made about the importance of that network and of the social investment made in it.

The problem arises—and this is why I am so concerned about the cost recovery approach—when the political process and the market force process get confused with each other in the government operation. As soon as you put the government in the market place in the role of an entrepreneur, you have lost the complementary character of these two means for allocating resources and you put the government agency with its own subsidization and its own financial support in the position of having price income on which it can now base other decisions. And it bases its decisions not simply on the political process, which can govern it, but on the market process, which really cannot and should not govern it. And I am very concerned when I see government agencies get into the market place with market motivations, as represented by cost recovery.

MR. ROSENTHAL (University of California, Bekeley): A few words about the depository library system and the libraries in it. Much as I endorse the role of the depository system, I am a little wary of the primary role that is being thrust upon the libraries in that system in the information process, as described in the report. It has long been acknowledged, it seems to me, that the depository libraries add an enormous increment to the so-called gift of government publications. Joe Morehead, by implication and example, illustrated this in his discussion of the microfiche distribution of congressional bills, which have always involved considerable expenditures on the part of libraries, whether they are in microform or hard copy. I do not think there needs to be much elaboration on the very likely additional cost to libraries that will certainly be in order in the way of such things as equipment, acquisition costs of the products of the for-profit sector, and in the way of service as we move into new technology.

But the role of the depository library system aside, I would like to comment on the over-all thrust of the report. I think it is a very important report, by a distinguished group of people. And I am afraid that it may have the effect of settling discussion rather than opening it. It has, as one looks at the panelists and at the very well expressed conclusions, the weight of, or it will likely be perceived as, an objective analysis of a very difficult subject. And, thanks to Bob Hayes' very laudable attempt to achieve consensus, it seems to me quite possible that it will stand as a definitive statement rather than as a beginning statement.

And that worries me, because I see the overall approach of the report putting the burden of proof on the government sector in supplying information, that all information products must be justified and the justification will often be on the basis of cost and presumed benefit. The private sector, on the other hand, it seems to me, emerges virtually unfettered and unobligated. There is even less guarantee of continuity in products and services than with shifting governmental structure and funding that change with political ties. And there is little or no public oversight for the private sector with regard to the way that products and services are selected and packaged and priced. In other words, it seems to me that it abets the policy of "them that has, gets."

MR. LUCKER: I want to thank Don and the panelists for what I think is an exceptional program. I should also point out again that Penny Abell, ARL's Vice President, was responsible for putting the program together.

BUSINESS MEETING

MR. LUCKER: We have a very full agenda today and I will need your cooperation to get through it on time. First, I would like to announce that at the Board meeting held yesterday, in accordance with the ARL Bylaws, James Govan, Director of Libraries at the University of North Carolina, was elected ARL Vice President/President-Elect for 1982.

Election of Board Members

MR. LUCKER: The first item on the agenda is the election of new Board members. For that I call upon Vice President Penny Abell, who served as chair of the Nominating Committee.

MS. ABELL: Serving with me on the 1981 ARL Nominating Committee were Margot McBurney of Queen's University and Kenneth Peterson of Southern Illinois University. In accordance with the ARL Bylaws, we offer the following candidates for election to three-year terms on the ARL Board of Directors: William Studer, Ohio State University; Richard Talbot, University of Massachusetts; and Anne Woodsworth, York University.

MR. LUCKER: The Bylaws provide for additional nominations to be made from the floor. There is an assumption that if a person is nominated, the nominator has the agreement of the person that he or she is willing to run for election. Are there any nominations from the floor? Hearing none, I will assume that nominations are closed. Will someone propose a motion for election by acclamation?

MR. WYATT (University of Rochester): I so move.

MR. LUCKER: Mr. Wyatt moves. Is that seconded?

SEVERAL MEMBERS: Second.

MR. LUCKER: All those in favor. Anybody opposed? The motion carries. Thank you. Congratulations and commiserations to the new Board members.

Report of the Executive Director

MS. ECHELMAN: I have departed from ARL tradition this afternoon by presenting, for the first time in the cumulative memory of the former ARL Executive Directors who are present at this meeting, a written report to the Membership. [See p. 67] This was done chiefly to save as much time as possible this afternoon for discussion of important issues by the membership. So, although it is a departure from tradition, I hope you will indulge me and agree that it will allow us to use our time together this afternoon more efficiently. In these few minutes, I would like to supplement the written report with some late news and a few comments.

The first part of my report deals with legislation and how the ARL Office, the ARL Federal Relations Committee, and those of you who are participating in the ARL legislative network are working in ARL's interest. In addition, I would like to report on a number of specific legislative items. First, however, I would like to take the opportunity to thank all of you who have responded so splendidly to our requests to activate the legislative network. It is hard to quantify the results, but we feel very strongly that it has been effective and it could only have been effective with your help.

The Library of Congress continues to operate under a one-year continuing resolution. Apparently its funding is secure at $189.8 million, and no further action is anticipated on LC's budget at the present time. On a further matter to do with the Library, the amendment which was proposed by Representative Chalmers Wylie (R-OH) to prevent LC's reproducing Playboy in braille was not introduced on the floor of the Congress because no amendments were allowed under the rules of debate. Apparently this issue has died aborning, at least for the time being.

The Higher Education Act Title II-C program, Strengthening Research Library Resources, is operating under a continuing resolution until November 20, with $6 million in appropriations. This seems likely to be the final appropriations figure, however, the Senate Appropriations Committee is still dickering with the White House and our friends at the Office of Management and Budget over further cuts. Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker, meanwhile, is pushing for floor action on the entire budget next week. The appropriations committees seem, as far as we can tell, to be looking for large ticket items. Depending upon how you look at it, $6 million is either a large ticket or a small ticket item. We are hopeful that to the Senate it is the latter. You may, however, want to give your senators a call next Monday or Tuesday to stress the importance of Title II-C to research libraries; especially members of the Senate Appropriations Committee. The House has already taken action at the $6 million level; therefore, if the Senate takes similar action, there will be no need for a conference committee on this item.

Legislation regarding appropriations for the International Communications Agency (ICA) is being monitored very closely by the Association of American Universities (AAU), and Tom Litzenburg of AAU has asked me to report to you on it. Three major scholarly exchange programs are administered through ICA: the Fulbright Scholarship Program, the International Research and Exchange Board (IREX), and the Committee for Scholarly Communication with the Peoples Republic of China. AAU believes that these programs are all in danger. The Administration has requested a 66 percent reduction in funds for the educational and cultural affairs programs of ICA. This includes a 53 percent reduction in funding for the three programs named above. AAU is taking the lead for the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS), the Social Science Research Council, and the research universities. Mr. Litzenburg's phone number is 466-5030, should you want further information.

Interior Department and related agency appropriations have been passed by the House with $144 million for the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), and by the Senate with $113.7 million for NEH. The conference on this bill is scheduled for November 4. The question before us is: can the strong support in the House, generated largely by Representative Sidney Yates (D-IL), endure the test of the conference? The House figures, as you recall, are well above those in the

Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act. This still needs to be watched closely. I would also like to take this opportunity to mention the very important work done by the Presidential Task Force on the Arts and Humanities, especially in confirming the importance of a change in the tax code to allow a deduction for the donation of manuscripts and works of art by creators of those works to libraries, archives, and museums.

Copies of the new proposed regulations for Title II-C have been brought to this meeting by Office of Libraries and Learning Technologies (OLLT) staff. As you all know, the Secretary of Education has made certain recommendations to the President concerning the future of the Department of Education. In the meantime, OLLT continues its work, including preparation of these new regulations for public comment. Ray Fry is with us this afternoon to brief us on the regulations and other matters of interest.

MR. FRY (Department of Education): I would like to make a few comments on the process and schedule for reviewing the regulations and on the fiscal 1982 grant schedule. As Shirley said, copies of the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking are at the back of the room. The notice was published in the Federal Register on Wednesday, October 28. We need your comments on or before December 14, and we hope we will get many comments from this group. We certainly appreciated the advice you have already given us, and you will find that much of your counseling is reflected in the new proposed rules. We were very happy that 60 directors responded to the survey that was conducted by the ARL Office last spring. And, believe me, our task force working on the regulations spent a lot of time reviewing your advice. There are some major changes in the regulations, but there is not time today to go into any of those, as it would take at least a two-hour discussion period, and you had an opportunity to discuss a number of these points at the May ARL Meeting. The calendar is as follows: December 14 is the deadline for public comment; our target date for the final rules to be published in the Federal Register is June 1, 1982, with the effective date, we hope, of July 15, 1982. Because of this tight schedule, we asked and received permission to use our old regulations in the fiscal 1982 grant schedule. We were afraid to risk trying to get the new regulations through, because if we had come down to the fourth quarter and the new regulations were delayed and we could not use them, after mailing them out to you in an application package, we would have to start all over and it could have endangered the program.

As Shirley said, we still hope to have $6 million in this year's program. There is the possibility of a 12 percent cut; we hope no more. Our deadline for applications is February 18, 1982, and we hope to make awards by June 25. These dates, however, are subject to change.

I would like to make one or two quick comments on a couple of other projects that we are working on that may be of interest to you. Last year, for the first time, we allotted some money to dissemination of information about II-C projects, and several libraries have done beautiful brochures and other dissemination efforts on their II-C projects. Unfortunately, there is a moratorium on such activities and until further notice we will not be able to give any more dissemination grants.

In our Research and Demonstration (R&D) Program last year we issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) for a major study of library education. We had 500 inquiries in response, which I think, shows that there is substantial interest in

improving library education. Unfortunately, Congress voted a rescission of $250,000 of our $500,000 in R&D, and we had to cancel the RFP. We are in the process of rewriting and, we hope, improving the RFP. As our plans now stand, we will reissue the RFP and we hope you will be interested and stimulate some good proposals.

One last project that I would like to mention is our research needs of the 1980s project. Last year we funded Cuadra Associates under the Research and Development Program to help arrive at a research agenda for the next decade. Some people have accused us of trying to come up with the research agenda for the country—that was never the intention. It is just a research agenda, an attempt to establish some priorities for the types of research projects the Department should be funding with the little money that we have. We hope that private institutions and corporations may be interested in funding some of these programs as well. That project is nearing completion. Twenty top priority research projects have been identified and we are going to have a colloquium on December the 2 to discuss them. The colloquium will be of 15 national leaders, including the President of this Association, here in Washington to discuss this research agenda and its implications, to analyze it, and to help us determine ways that the information might be disseminated.

MS. ECHELMAN: Thank you, Ray. I would now like to call on Margaret Child to make a brief report about the National Endowment for the Humanities' Research Resources Program.

MS. CHILD: As Shirley has already told you, we have had appropriations bills go through both houses of Congress now and, as she mentioned, they will be going to conference next week. However, this does not mean that the agency is home free, by any manner of speaking. Our appropriation is part of the Interior and Related Agencies Bill. If that total package goes through much above the level the President had recommended in his budget to Congress early in the year, there is a very real possibility of a veto. Meanwhile, we are on a continuing resolution, like most of the rest of the government, and the monies which are being released to the agency are being released not on the basis of the appropriations levels that have been passed by the two houses of Congress, but on the basis of that original presidential request. For NEH, this was $85 million minus another 12 percent cut, which brings us down to $74 million. In effect, the agency is operating at a very reduced level. This, of course, has particular impact on our administrative funds and those of us, as the Research Resources Program is now doing, who are holding panels to review applications which came in for next June, are finding that we are practically inviting panelists to rollerskate to Washington in order to review the proposals that are now being considered for funding.

So the situation is still very much up in the air. Several directors asked me about the state of the Challenge Grant Program. That program, in particular, is very much dependent upon the level at which the fiscal 1982 appropriation finally does go through, because if we manage to get as a final appropriation more than the $85 million which President Reagan recommended for the agency, then at least some of that increase will go to reviving the Challenge Grant Program. If we are not funded at that level, then the Challenge Grant Program is, to all intents and purposes, dead, at least for this year. Meanwhile, we have just had our first Office of Management and Budget hearing on our fiscal 1983 budget, and the signs are not promising that there will be any sympathy for giving us funds that are much above that original $85 million figure.

Also, NEH does not yet have a chairman. That announcement has been the subject of a certain amount of commentary in the national press. So for both the funding levels of the agency and the question of who the next chairman will be, I guess my main message is to keep reading The New York Times.

MS. ECHELMAN: Thank you, Margaret. One of the more exciting projects that ARL is embarked on at present is the ARL Microform Project, about which I have reported in my written report. I need not say anything further about the project at this time except to take this opportunity to thank the Council on Library Resources and the Mellon Foundation for their generous support and their deep understanding of the potential importance of the project to research libraries and to libraries in general. It is an example of ARL at its best, I think, focused on an important issue and working in cooperation with several other groups who have a mutual interest and a need for coordination of effort.

Jeffrey Heynen has been appointed Coordinator for the ARL Microform Project, and I would like to take this opportunity to introduce him to the Membership.

I reported briefly in the most recent issue of the ARL Newsletter on the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) meeting in Leipzig. Ten ARL directors attended this meeting, almost one-tenth of our membership, and eight of them were able to attend a meeting that we arranged for ARL members of IFLA. One of the things that they asked me to tell you when I reported to you was that Montreal will be the site of the 1982 IFLA meeting, August 22-28. Since it is on the North American continent, it would be a splendid opportunity for more ARL directors to become involved in the work of this important international organization.

As I said at the ARL Meeting last May, I plan to visit with as many of you on your campuses as I possibly can, to talk with you, with your staffs, your administrations and faculty in whatever settings that you might like to devise for me to do so. My first visits will be in California, to UCLA and the University of Southern California, in conjunction with the Frontiers Conference in December. In January, right after ALA Midwinter in Denver, I will visit with the University of Colorado and Colorado State. And in March I have been invited to come to Texas to visit with the four Texas members, an opportunity that I am looking forward to with great anticipation. If any of you would like me to come talk with you and your staffs about ARL, I would be glad to try to fit as many visits as I can and as we can afford into my schedule. I hope by the end of four years to have visited personally every ARL library.

Now, without further delay, I would like to proceed to a discussion of the 1982 ARL Budget. On September 24, the Office sent you a draft of the 1982 budget. That draft had been reviewed and commented upon by the Board after an Executive Committee conference call which took place on August 26. In addition, an alternative budget was prepared for distribution at this meeting.

The original draft was prepared last July, based on the information available in the Office at the time. Our basic information was the six-month financial report. On reviewing the nine-month financial report, which I received in early October, we learned that we had done extremely well on our interest income; in fact, much

better than we thought we were going to do. We, therefore, prepared an alternative budget in mid-October for your consideration and that of the Board. Also, in preparing these documents, we attempted a moderate restructure of the relationship of line items so that groups of expenses are displayed somewhat differently than they have been in the past. We hope that this change will enable all of us to better understand the logical relationship of expense items to one another within the major groupings.

In the original draft, we proposed a dues income of $384,000 for 1982. This embodies implicitly a dues increase of $400 per year per member, or 13.5 percent, which is within the guidelines that Jay Lucker reported to you last May. In addition, we are projecting interest income for 1982 at $39,000.

The October 15 alternative budget is based on a somewhat different assumption from the original draft, and projects a dues increase of $300 per year per member, or 10 percent. In addition to this, to make up the shortfall, we are proposing that $9,250 from the projected 1981 surplus be transferred not to the Reserve Fund as originally intended, but to 1982 operations. In other words, we are suggesting that we use some of the windfall profits from the economic situation that we all find ourselves in to help us run the organization next year.

Now I would like to comment just briefly on a couple of the other items in the budget. Salaries, as you know, are a major part of our budget. We have begun a review of ARL's salary administration policy using a number of available sources of information, including a survey which was developed by McManis Associates in Washington. This survey has an excellent ten-year history of comparing salaries in nonprofit educational associations, both on a size-of-budget basis and on a geographical location basis. Some of the expense items seem to us to require explanation as we began to construct the budget, and these mostly have been footnoted for your information. If you have any questions about them or any comments to make, I would be very glad to respond to them at the present time.

The alternative budget is very tight in terms of the amount of surplus provided, but it is, in my best opinion, a viable planning document on which we can base our operations for the next year. I would like to pass on to you, however, probably the most valuable lesson that I learned in 13 years of work with Chemical Bank in New York: no budget is ever cast in stone and every budget should be seen simply as a planning tool for the purpose of management control.

At this point, I will turn the meeting over to Jay for a discussion of the dues increase.

MR. LUCKER: Thank you, Shirley. Y. T., did you have a question?

MS. FENG (Harvard University): Yes. Before I go to that, I have a question out of ignorance. Do we discuss the budget now or later before we vote on the dues increase?

MR. LUCKER: In accordance with the ARL Bylaws, the budget is to come before the Board of Directors following this meeting, and the approval of the budget is the responsibility of the Board. However, the budget cannot be approved until the membership sets the dues for next year. The responsibility for setting dues rests

with the membership; the responsibility for approving the budget rests with the Board. To get the item on the floor for discussion, I am, therefore, on behalf of the Board of Directors, proposing that the membership approve a dues increase for 1982 of $300 rather than $400. In accordance with the Bylaws, members must receive notification of a dues increase in writing prior to the meeting, which you have all received, and I am exercising the right of the Chair to say that we believe it is correct for the Board to change the amount, even though we have notified you of a specific increase. If anybody feels that that is improper, they may appeal the ruling of the Chair. Since this has been put forth by the Board, it does not require a second, and therefore I will open the floor for any discussion of the dues increase. That also will provide an opportunity for you to raise any questions about the budget.

MS. FENG: At the risk of appearing ungracious when the Board has reduced the proposed dues from $400 to $300, I would like to still make a statement on behalf of Harvard University Library. We question the extent of ARL's subsidy of the Office of Management Studies. We also question the very fact that a project, no matter how laudable and how useful, should not be self-supporting for an organization like this. For these reasons Harvard will vote against the proposed dues increase.

MS. ECHELMAN: I appreciate what Y. T. has said and I understand her concerns. However, I think I should point out that every library association does operate programs which are supported from general membership dues. ALA has a large number of them. The Special Libraries Association has a Continuing Education Program, a Professional Development Program, and a Consultation Program, all of which are supported from member dues. The Medical Library Association puts approximately $75,000 of its dues income every year into a Continuing Education Program. The reason that these associations do this is because they believe that there are certain programs which are required by the entire membership but which cannot be adequately funded out of cost recovery or grant income.

I believe that in ARL there has been a general understanding that help with management of large university libraries is a program on which ARL is willing to spend its dues income, and that is why the Board took the action that it did last May. I think it is useful to remember that the Office of Management Studies is more to the Association than simply a membership service. It is, in effect, a small nonprofit management consulting firm which has been set up by the Association with help from various funding agencies to aid the research libraries of North America to solve complex and important management problems. It has been funded largely through grants and cost-recovery items; the direct ARL monetary support for OMS is a very modest contribution to its total operations, amounting to approximately 18.5 percent in 1982.

MR. LUCKER: Are there other questions or comments on the dues increase and the budget? I assume, therefore, that you are ready for the question. In accordance with the Bylaws, in order for us to vote on any business, it is required that we have a majority of the members. I declare that there are at least 57 member libraries represented. If anybody wants to question that, they may. In order to pass any action, we must have at least one third of the membership voting affirmatively, which, according to my mental calculation, is 38 affirmative votes.

Let me remind you that only the institutional representatives may vote, that

is, directors or designated alternates. If any guests feel moved to vote, please sit on your hands. Will all those in favor of the dues increase of $300, please raise their hands. (Show of majority of hands.) Thank you.

Will all those opposed please raise their hands. For the record, I would like a count of the negative votes. The Minutes will show that there are approximately 13 negative votes.

Report of the Office of Management Studies

MR. LUCKER: The next item on the agenda—and maybe it sounds coincidential but it is the next item on the agenda—is a report from the Office of Management Studies by Duane Webster.

MR. WEBSTER: There is a folder of descriptive materials covering current OMS services in the back of the room. These materials give you a complete review of the resources provided to member libraries by the OMS. Today I will briefly highlight some of the new directions we are taking to enhance our ability to help member libraries confront contemporary concerns.

First I will comment on the new Economics of Research Libraries Project, sponsored by ARL and the Research Libraries Group, with funding from the Council on Library Resources. The Office helped prepare and conduct a small exploratory meeting of academic administrators, library directors, economists, and management specialists to consider the dimension of the economic pressures facing research libraries and some ideas for strengthening the collective response to these problems. A report of these discussions is being prepared and will be available shortly. A resource notebook containing some background papers on some of the issues involved, the concept of decision support systems, and a description of a financial planning model for research libraries was prepared for these discussions. While the notebook is not being distributed widely, it is available to ARL directors upon request.

The second area I want to comment on is the Public Services Project. The University of Houston completed the initial study in this project on schedule this summer. OMS has submitted a grant proposal to the General Electric Foundation in hope of securing funds to allow us to make the study more widely available to ARL members; a decision is expected this fall. We expect to announce availability of the study process by the spring of 1982.

The third area I want to mention on is the Academic Library Program (ALP), which covers the self-studies operated by the OMS. The Collection Analysis Program (CAP) is the most active of the self-study programs we provide for ARL members; 15 member libraries have completed a CAP study. We anticipate ten ARL members conducting ALP self-studies during the next year. A list of study participants is available in the ALP brochure, which is part of the folder which I mentioned, and reports from the completed studies are available from OMS upon request.

A new direction that we are taking with the self-study process is making

available to member libraries individually-tailored studies to meet specific needs. We have worked with Ohio State, for example, in designing and conducting a study of technical services. We have worked with several other libraries in reorganization studies, team-building efforts, and planning studies. OMS staff are willing to meet with you to discuss possibilities in this area.

The fourth area I want to cover is the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC). This is not a new program, but since the last ARL Meeting, we have issued flyers and kits covering bibliographic search services, the use of small computers in libraries, and recruitment and selection procedures in ARL libraries. We have also issued occasional papers on the topics of compensation systems and communication practices. Topics planned for future coverage include internships, specialist positions, document delivery services, services to the disabled, and book approval plans.

In the area of training and organizational development, we continue to make a variety of training resources available to member libraries. New efforts in this area include an Advanced Management Skills Institute for people at the upper levels of management in research libraries. Also, we are making the Basic Management Skills Institute available more widely. Any member may host an institute simply by assuring that at least 20 people from the region will attend the event. We are also conducting special focus workshops for ARL members on the topics of public services, supervisory skills, and performance appraisal.

Another project, the Planning Program for Small Academic Libraries, is being phased out because of concerns expressed by members that, while separately funded by the Lilly Endowment, the project diverted OMS attention from more pressing research library matters. As a result, we are looking at a way of working with the ALA Association of College and Research Libraries to make the planning program more generally available with a reduced level of OMS staff involvement.

The next project is the Preservation Planning Project funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities. Pamela Darling, the Project Coordinator will give us a brief update on that project.

MS. DARLING: Development of the Preservation Planning Program seems to be proceeding well. Of the three pilot tests, Dartmouth and the University of Virginia have completed their studies, and the University of Washington expects to be finished around Thanksgiving. All three have also completed extensive evaluations of the project materials, which will be of great help in the revision process taking place in the next couple of months. Through this testing and evaluation process we have identified a number of ways in which the self-study process itself can be both steamlined and strengthened, and the resulting product should prove an efficient tool in a wide variety of library situations.

The revised self-study manual and the accompanying technical resource data should be available for general distribution in March 1982, at the end of the NEH-funded project. I also expect to have copies of the Dartmouth and Virginia reports next month for those of you who would like to see what the process accomplished in those test libraries. Washington's final report should be available around the end of the year. And let me take this opportunity to thank Merle Boylan, Ray Frantz, Margaret Otto, and their staffs for the very high quality of their

contributions to the development of this program.

I will also take just a moment to report to you on a by-product of this project. In response to the continuing need for accurate, up-to-date technical information on a wide variety of preservation topics, we put together several months ago a draft proposal for a preservation information service, which was circulated for reaction to a representative group of you and was discussed with the ARL Preservation Committee this morning. Many valuable suggestions came in, enabling us to refine our definition of the need and the mechanisms which might be employed to meet it. On Wednesday of this week I met with Peter Sparks, the new Chief of the Preservation Office at the Library of Congress, to discuss his plans for expanding LC's role in this area. Happily, it appears that LC will be stepping up and systematizing its already impressive preservation information services in the next years. Consequently, we are tabling our plans for the present and will be continuing discussions with Dr. Sparks to insure that ARL member needs will be influential in shaping the level and direction of LC's services. My thanks to each of you who shared your views about the original proposal. The many good ideas generated through those discussions should benefit the whole profession.

Finally, a reminder that the Preservation Planning Program will be available next spring. I have talked with several of you already about scheduling preservation studies during the 1982 and we expect to be able to accommodate a few more. Additional information about the process will be sent to all members in a month or so, but I would be glad to answer any questions you may have before then.

MR. WEBSTER: Thank you, Pam. New directions that we are discussing with the help of the OMS Advisory Committee include a review of the Collection Analysis Program to assess the impact of those studies and to determine what additional resources might be needed to help research libraries deal with collection management concerns. Secondly, we are considering the provision of survey and analytical assistance to help libraries gather information, make decisions, and revise policies in areas of specific concern. And, thirdly, a follow-up to the economics meeting will be made with a modest effort to create a generalized financial planning model for research libraries.

The last item I will review is the recent survey of ARL directors concerning their perspectives on the success of the Office of Management Studies. This survey of your opinions was suggested by the OMS Advisory Committee as one way of checking to see if you continue to support this activity of the Association and what ideas you have for strengthening it. This is the third time in ten years that we have gone to the directors for an assessment of the overall programs and activities of OMS. And I might say parenthetically that each of the component activities are evaluated by participants in that activity. As of October 28, the Office has received 62 responses to the survey. I have received another dozen during the course of this meeting. The expressed level of satisfaction with the overall OMS program was 7.4 on a scale, with 1 representing not satisfied, 5 representing satisfied, and 10 representing very satisfied. The usefulness of the Office services and resources was rated at 7.5. A tabulation of your responses to date is in the OMS folder; a full report on the responses will be prepared and distributed toward the end of the year. The OMS Advisory Committee is reviewing the results and will determine what future changes are needed within OMS to make it more useful to you. Committee members will be visiting several member libraries to complement

the information provided in that survey, and they will also be meeting with OMS staff in a two-day formal review of the Office and its priorities for the future in January of 1982.

Report of the Canadian Association of Research Libraries

MR. LUCKER: The next item on the agenda is a report from the Canadian Association of Research Libraries (CARL). In our continuing effort to improve and establish firm communications and cooperation with CARL, the ARL Executive Director or President attends CARL Meetings, and the President of CARL is invited to ARL Meetings. It is a great pleasure to introduce Anne Woodsworth, who is the present President of the Canadian Association of Research Libraries and a new member of the ARL Board.

MS. WOODSWORTH (York University): Thank you, Jay. I should point out that I am really Basil Stuart-Stubbs and I am here because he vacated our camp of CARL and joined the deans of library schools in Canada. As a result, I got bumped up very quickly from Vice President-Elect to President-Elect and hence, here I am.

CARL's last meeting was on June 10 and it was reported very succinctly and accurately in the ARL Newsletter, so I will not recount the activities. There has been very little activity in the last four and a half months since that meeting. We have, however, found a part-time Executive Secretary and are processing papers for incorporation. Despite a 42-day mail strike, we did manage to get the papers around to our Executive, get them signed, and get them to the offices in Ottawa. We anticipate being incorporated as a not-for-profit corporation by our November 17 meeting.

Future plans include a joint meeting with the deans of the library schools—yes, we are going to get Basil back—next June in 1982 in Saskatoon. And in the fall of 1982 we are planning a one-day program on collection development activity in connection with our meeting. Beyond that, we are having a joint meeting with ARL in Banff, to which I understand a delegation from the Standing Council of National and University Libraries (SCONUL) librarians from Great Britain have been invited as well.

Report of the ARL Committee on the Preservation of Research Library Materials

MR. LUCKER: The next item is a report from the ARL Preservation Committee, presented by David Stam, chair of that committee.

MR. STAM (New York Public Library): Thank you, Jay. I will be very brief. It will not cost you any money and it may save you some in the long run. This is not really a report of my committee, but a request for an endorsement from the membership of a recent paper.

For the past three years, I have represented this Association on the Council on

Library Resources-sponsored Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity, a committee chaired by Herbert Bailey, director of the Princeton University Press. Our aspirations as a committee have been not so much to legislate good production standards as to increase the awareness of authors, librarians, and especially the book production managers of publishers about the threat to their products of destructive materials and poor production standards. Our first report, on book paper, appeared in April, following several drafts and an invitational conference on the subject at the Library of Congress last February. The report has been printed in Publishers Weekly and received fairly wide coverage, including a not very helpful account in American Libraries which was headed: "Book Longevity. Who cares?" I believe you will all have received copies of the report. Our major finding is that the cost of books printed on acid-free paper would not be significantly higher if there were sufficient demand by publishers for that kind of paper. Our role as librarians is to help create that demand.

I will not summarize other parts of the report here. But for the ARL Committee on the Preservation of Research Library Materials, I would like to move for membership approval of the official endorsement by this Association of the Interim Report on Book Paper published by the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity. As a committee report, I do not think that needs a second.

MR. LUCKER: That is correct. A committee motion does not require a second. Is there any discussion on the motion that this Association endorse the Interim Guidelines? Or are there any questions for David or the committee? Seeing no hands, I assume you are ready for the question.

All those in favor of the motion please signify by saying "aye." Anybody opposed, say "nay." [The motion passed unanimously.]

Report of the Network Advisory Committee

MR. LUCKER: The next item is a report from the Network Advisory Committee (NAC). Henriette Avram of the Library of Congress will report for the committee.

MS. AVRAM (Library of Congress): The theme of the last NAC meeting was resource sharing, in the sense of interlibrary loan and document delivery. We thought it would be useful to present several of the available technologies. So we invited Satellite Business Systems (SBS) to talk to us and also our own David Remington of the Library of Congress's Cataloging Distribution Service (CDS).

Satellite Business Systems is a partnership among Aetna Life & Casualty, COMSAT, and IBM. They have developed applications to provide conventional telephone services for data exchange, telecommunications, electronic mail, and data communications. It was an interesting session. The technology has implications for document delivery, but SBS was very, very reluctant to answer any of our specific questions at all.

On the other hand, Dave Remington told us about the optical disc technology that is being used at the Library of Congress. The optical disc-based technology

permits the Library to archive millions of non-MARC records, i.e., our card record sets that are not MARC, in virtual facsimile through the use of high-resolution scan and printout, and it is using computer-driven laser electrostatic printing systems. Now, that sounds pretty high level. The system is designed to print on demand a single facsimile of an image at the rate of two sheets of six images each per second; it is fast and the resolution is high—480 lines per inch. The images are in compressed digital form and they will reside on approximately two dozen optical discs, i.e., 5.5 million cards will reside on 24 discs. The optical disc technology provides a major solution to the problems of preservation, automated storage and retrieval, terminal display, and facsimile reproduction. So it is obvious why we invited CDS to describe to us this technology, because it does have a tremendous impact for document delivery.

We also asked Donald Simpson of the Center for Research Libraries (CRL) to discuss CRL's plans with us. Because CRL is well known to ARL membership, I will just say that Don gave us a very interesting report on his major programs, his future priorities, including among them, which was of particular interest to NAC, the expanded access to journal literature.

We had asked for a thought paper to be prepared for the NAC meeting by Richard Boss. The paper was called "Resource Sharing: The Next Challenge." Following an overview of interlibrary lending, Dick came up with three alternative strategies: 1) a program to build a national data base of locations for library materials; 2) a program of linking existing and planned local, regional, and national data bases; and 3) not to do a thing. Specific questions were raised in connection with these three strategies in a follow-up discussion, and following action items were considered by the Network Advisory Committee:

1. Does NAC accept or reject the premise that there is either no compelling evidence of recurring need to create a nationwide location data base, or that this is not the right time to pursue such an objective?

2. If we do not need a nationwide location data base, should the Library of Congress Register of Additional Locations be expanded as a low-cost tool for libraries?

3. Should a program of coordinating existing location mechanisms be undertaken, with particular emphasis on linking the bibliographic utilities and on improving the capacity of the bibliographic utilities to provide information about serials holdings?

4. Should NAC encourage investigation of rapid telefacsimile and video disc and optical disc technology by the appropriate library groups?

The committee was divided into working groups and discussed those themes for the rest of the day. Three major themes emerged from the results of the discussion groups:

1. The location system for monographs is fairly well under control.

2. Of immediate concern is the need to standardize detailed holding statements for serials.

3. Of principal concern was the need to work on the improvement of the transfer of materials for better access, taking into account the video and optical disc technologies.

The sense of the meeting was that we should suggest to the appropriate standards-making groups that we come up with a standard for detailed holdings but that the next meeting of NAC should concentrate on the requirements for document transfer and the formulation of specific plans or projects. Therefore, a planning committee was appointed for the next meeting, which will take place on March 9-11, 1982, to discuss these items. Thank you.

Report on the Eighteenth-Century Short Title Catalogue Project

MR. LUCKER: I am going to ask Henry Snyder from Louisiana State University to talk about the Eighteenth-Century Short Title Catalogue (ESTC) Project.

MR. SNYDER: I am pleased to report to you that the project continues to move ahead according to schedule. As of the first of this month, 282 libraries had agreed to contribute to the project and records have been received from 199 of them. Most important, 88 members of this group have agreed to contribute and we have good hopes of persuading most of the rest. Indeed, we have negotiated tentative agreements with two ARL libraries just since the first of October. I believe you will agree that this is a major accomplishment and the best possible sign of the support we are receiving from the library community.

In terms of records, the only estimate we have, and, of course, it is purely conjectural, is that there are 1,300,000 titles in North American libraries that should be included in the ESTC. We already have on hand 350,000 records; I expect to have over half a million within about three or four months. We have processed 186,500 of those 350,000 records and have been able to match 122,500. The balance will have to be rechecked once the British Library has completed its recataloguing effort some time next spring. The highest percentage we have matched in any given week is 60 percent, more often the figure hovers in the low 50s. There are several explanations. We have received a good deal of material from specialized libraries—medical libraries, Methodist theological libraries, for example—which have holdings in areas in which the British Library is relatively weak. Also we have received some material such as sheet music that does not belong. As we work primarily from photocopies of catalog cards, there are naturally errors or often too brief an entry to make a precise match. Some of these are sufficiently full that we can enter the record in the unverified section of the file; that is, we believe it is the same but we are not absolutely sure. Approximately 25 percent of the records so far matched have been entered as unverified. We would like to reduce this percentage, but require assistance on the part of contributing libraries. We are returning approximately 10 percent of the records we receive for further data or elucidation.

The British Library has catalogued approximately 140,000 titles of their projected 150,000 separate titles of ESTC material. Once the recataloguing effort is finished, next spring or early next summer, they will begin the task of editing the

file with the goal of producing a COM version in 1983 which they will market for sale. They have also negotiated an agreement with Research Publications, Inc. (RPI) to prepare a microfiche edition of their ESTC holdings, that is to say, of the texts themselves. They will be selected, of course, but it will still be a very substantial file. RPI plans to market this in eight or nine sets segregated by the nature of the material, but titles will also be available individually, ordered by ESTC number. So a scholar will be able to go to our file, find the title he wants, send the ESTC number to RPI, and purchase the fiche that contains that title. Research Publications has also asked us to augment the series with selected items from North American libraries not found in the British Library. We have agreed to work with them in identifying the titles to be added and the holding libraries. And, of course, there should be some income derived from this effort for the libraries contributing.

The British Library file was mounted on BLAISE in London this month and is now accessible to BLAISE subscribers over a year in advance because of the pressure that we have exerted. A copy of the tape is being sent to the Research Libraries Group (RLG) this week, and RLG is now engaged in designing the software to manipulate it. The design phase should be completed by December 1. We expect that the tape will be mounted and that we will be working online by mid-December. The file will be accessible immediately to all RLG members. Further software design will be necessary before non-RLG members can access the file. We expect that work to be completed about February 1, 1983. Then any library which has been certified by us as having contributed records may access the file on TYMNET. The cost for RLG members is scaled at $22.50 an hour; the cost for non-RLG members will be $67.50 plus the standard TYMNET charge.

This is necessarily a brief report, but I would be glad to answer questions now or after the meeting. I hope we may continue to count on the full support of this group. I believe we all have a great deal to gain from it. Thank you.

MR. LUCKER: Thank you, Henry.

Report of the Council on Library Resources

MR. LUCKER: The next item on the agenda is a report on the Council on Library Resources (CLR) and on the Association of American Universities (AAU)/CLR Task Forces from CLR President Warren J. Haas.

MR. HAAS (Council on Library Resources): Thanks, Jay. Last March, CLR joined forces with the Association of American Universities, convinced that the magnitude of the problems facing the research library world over the next decade—problems, as you all know, brought on by the economic realities, technology, and politics, with a lower-cased "p"—all suggested that research libraries are in for a dramatic transformation in the way they work and in the way they fulfill their obligations, and that, probably, it would be a mistake for librarians to plot that future acting in isolation and alone. So, we talked with AAU and their Library Committee, and there was full agreement that somehow university officers, working scholars, and librarians needed to jointly address this set of concerns. We called a one-day session in Washington of about ten or 12 people, a mix of people from the library world, the foundation world, and the scholarly world. It was a

first-rate discussion; I think everybody's horizons were widened. Out of that effort, we decided to proceed and named five task forces, each to include university officers, librarians, and scholars, to address key matters in what seemed to be the important areas.

The task forces are: Preservation, chaired by David Stam of the New York Public Library; Resource Sharing, chaired by Oscar Handlin of the Harvard University Libraries; Bibliographic Control, chaired by Hannah Gray, President of the University of Chicago; Technology—its impact not only on libraries, but the whole process of scholarly communication over the next decade—chaired by Richard Cyert, President of Carnegie-Mellon University; and the Profession of Librarianship—its nature, its importance, and all matters related to professional education. Because the Council had already cranked up its professional education program (PETREL) and had already formed an advisory committee of people who, in fact, represented all three camps, we simply added this responsibility to the PETREL Advisory Committee as well.

In five months or so since these groups were set up, all have met at least twice and all are now in the process of writing reports that present each task force's sense of the most important issues and some sense of the way to go about solving them. These five reports will be pulled together and will serve as the foundation for what I hope will be a fairly substantial meeting next spring. I hope that meeting will be sponsored by all of the major discipline organizations, such as the American Council of Learned Societies and the National Academy of Sciences, as well as the university organizations, the American Council on Education, the AAU, and by the key library associations and organizations, of which ARL is the keyest of the key.

What we are trying to do here—by "we" I mean everybody that is involved — is to set an agenda for action in each of these areas that is both professionally responsible and fiscally credible, so that in fact there is some prospect that things will actually happen. The reason for involving these sets of people is that we seem to spend an awful lot of our time convincing our colleagues that what we are about is right. And what we are trying to do here is to set an agenda that is well understood by university officers, librarians, and representatives of the scholarly disciplines, so that we can get on with the business of doing it rather than persuading each other that this is the right way to go.

I will not go into too much detail. But, just to give you an example, I will just pick the task force on preservation, chaired by Dave Stam. There are six members, including besides Dave: Herbert Bailey, President of Princeton University Press, Margaret Child, National Endowment for the Humanities; Lawrence Towner, Director of the Newberry Library; Billy Frye, Vice President for Academic Affairs at the University of Michigan; and Jaroslav Pelikan, Professor of History and Religious Studies at Yale University. I have read the minutes of these discussions and they are obviously getting down to bedrock. They have each assumed responsibility for preparing portions of their report, on topics such as: the scope of preservation planning, national planning vs. local initiative, preservation theory vs. preservation productivity, involving faculty administrators and libraries in preservation issues, practical issues in preservation programs, the role of future technology in preservation, and budget strategies. These individual topics are being addressed by a member of the task force, and they will meet once again to discuss findings and to prepare a draft of their report. And that draft will be one of the

parts of the raw material for this venture we anticipate in the early spring.

It is, I think, a remarkable enterprise in that we are slowly building in this country a set of individuals from all of the concerned arenas who are beginning to look at the problems that libraries face in somewhat the same way. Broadening the understanding of the issues that are facing us probably will be the principal long-term result of this enterprise.

Let me go on very briefly to another item. The Council itself has been the subject of my own speculation in the last few months. June 30 was the end of our 25th year, and I did not want to make the mistake of assuming that the future was simply an extension of the past. So in March, after our Board talked this over, we decided to set up a small group of people to take a look at the future of the Council on Library Resources. Four people were named to this group, two from the Council's own Board, and two who had very little knowledge about the Council. The first Board member is Robert Vosper, one of the most remarkable examples of the best that librarianship has had to offer nationally and internationally over the years. Ruth Davis is the second member of the Council's Board. Most recently Assistant Secretary of Energy, Ruth is a mathematician by training and a specialist in computer and communications technology. The two individuals who were willing to take part, giving a substantial amount of time, each of them with very little knowledge of the Council, are Robert O'Neil, President of the University of Wisconsin, and Neil Rudenstine, Provost of Princeton University.

Those four have spent the summer talking to a great many people in higher education, the foundation world, and the library world, and their colleagues and fellow faculty members. Yesterday I received the draft of their report, which will be the subject of a discussion at our Board meeting on November 14. The report takes a serious look at what the next decade has in store for research libraries and the process of scholarly communication, and then the real question: how can the Council be more useful? We intend to summarize that report in our own 25th annual report, which will be available for distribution about the first January.

I will stop there and make you an unrestricted grant of three minutes.

MR. LUCKER: Are there any questions for Jim? John McDonald.

MR. HAAS: He always tells me, he does not ask me.

MR. MCDONALD (University of Connecticut): Exactly what I was going to say. I do not have the temerity to question Jim.

Jim and I talked a little bit before he got up there and he was going to say a little something about the PETREL program, but since he has not, I will. Our grants to Michigan, UCLA, and the University of Chicago are bearing fruit. The Michigan program is under way; so is the Chicago program. The first Frontiers Conference is well along in planning, and some of you will be involved in that in December. Bob Hayes issued an invitation to all of you to nominate candidates for the Senior Fellows Program. I simply wanted to repeat the invitation here and now. And, of course, remember that he said you could nominate yourselves. Thank you.

Report of the Committee on ARL Statistics

MR. TALBOT (University of Massachusetts): I am pleased to tell you that this fiscal year saw the publication of two reports with which the Committee has been concerned for some time, and you all should have received copies of them. I would like to say a word or two about them. The author of both reports is Kendon Stubbs of the University of Virginia. The first report is the ARL Library Index and Quantitative Relationships in the ARL, and in it Kendon provides a very lucid explanation of factor analysis as applied to ARL data. This method of analysis has taken on added significance now since its adoption by ARL as one of its principal criteria for membership.

In the second report, Kendon shared authorship with David Buxton. The report is entitled: Cumulated ARL University Library Statistics, 1962-63 through 1978-79. This compilation should be a valuable resource to researchers in various areas, and the ARL Office hopes to encourage the use of the data by external agents. One of these external agents is the Research Libraries Group. RLG has already taken the data tapes and mounted them on its computer. Those libraries in RLG may be able to take advantage of these data and use them in a variety of ways.

We have only made modest changes in the annual cumulations of ARL statistics and the salary data this year. We have not noticed any great groundswell of interest in changing the data that people want collected, so we have not tried to pursue that at all. However, the slight changes that were made in the Salary Survey forms, now compiled by Gordon Fretwell of the University of Massachusetts, not only makes filling out the forms easier for most respondents, but permits more extensive analysis than ever before. And this year the committee will be looking at salary and rank patterns and hopes to issue a report on that. If any of you have further suggestions of what we might do with the salary and rank data, we would welcome them.

In general, the committee believes that significant changes in the present data collection patterns are not warranted. However, the measurement and management of library functions remains of pressing concern. Consequently, the committee has decided to turn its attention to performance measures, and this year the members of the committee intend to test some types of performance measures in their own libraries and, if successful, we hope next year to interest other ARL libraries in participating in the development of performance measures on a voluntary basis. To that end, we would welcome any expressions of willingness to participate in such a venture that any ARL library wishes to make. The rest of the committee members join me in this. They are: Anne Woodsworth, Ted Johnson, and Kendon Stubbs. Thank you.

Report of the ARL Task Force on Bibliographic Control

MR. LUCKER: The next item is the report from the Task Force on Bibliographic Control. Jim Govan will report for the Task Force.

MR. GOVAN (University of North Carolina): Thank you, Jay. I will make this

very brief. There is to be a written annual report in the Minutes and I hope that you will all have a chance to read it.

The task force continues to concentrate on trying to get management involved in the decisions affecting the cost of cataloging. This seems to have been our most recent area of concentration, and we have done a number of things to help that effort. One was to persuade the ALA Resources and Technical Services Division Board to back the idea of creating a series of questions on the impact of a proposed change in cataloging rules or standards that the proposing body must answer before any such changes are adopted.

Another such effort was the commissioning of the paper by D. Kaye Gapen on possibility of simplification of the MARC formats. That paper was distributed to all directors. We hope you will read the paper and, if you are like most of us, discuss it with your technical services staff, because some of it is a bit heavy sledding if you do not work in that area every day. But we believe it is vital for directors to be informed as much as possible on these issues, because, as you know, they are an increasingly heavy financial burden in a very tight budgetary period.

In that regard and in terms of discussing these issues that we bring to you, we are anxious too that when we ask, or for that matter, anybody asks, for a position statement from your library, that it represent a merger of management and technical services staff opinion. What is happening, as we found out with AACR 2, is that the technical services people are making decisions without full consideration of management and financial implications. And in order to prevent that, we must have one position for a library that represents both of these considerations.

Thank you very much.

Report on the CLR Bibliographic Services Development Program

MR. LUCKER: The next speaker is Lee Jones from the Council on Library Resources to report on the Bibliographic Services Development Program.

MR. JONES (Council on Library Resources): I am going to try something a little different this year. In past reports I have tended to be more thorough in coverage. This time I will select only those things that are really the highlights of the last six months.

In the area of standards, we are focusing most of our attention on telecommunication standards and have funded an effort to develop what is known as "application level protocol," that standard that allows computers to talk to one another about bibliographic information and to exchange data between the two units. James Aagaard at Northwestern University is at work on that standard and we hope to have it finished by next spring.

Relative to access to bibliographic data, you have already heard that we provided some modest support for the ARL Microform Project and also the ARL project on abstracting and indexing coverage in the CONSER data base. This is a planning activity at the moment, and we are delighted to be of assistance.

A major area that we have talked about before is in the area of name authorities and the Name Authority File Service Task Force is still hard at work. The last time I spoke to you, you had just received a requirements document on that service, and many of you responded to the task force. And, taking your comments and encouragement into consideration, implementation plans for that service are well under way.

Related to that, very dramatically, is a project we have going between the Washington Library Network (WLN), the Research Libraries Group, and the Library of Congress, called the Linked Authority Systems Project. I have spoken to you about that before. Two relatively significant products have been produced of late. One is a system process model: a narration of all of the processes the telecommunication link will have to support. The second product is the functional specifications document. That has been completed and it specifies how the system will function and is consistent with the Name Authority File Service requirements statement in nearly all facets. There are a couple of elements that will not immediately be available in the Linked Authority Systems Project that NAFS would like to see available, but that will come over time; we are confident of that. The project is now hard at work on developing the detailed functional specifications in preparation for software work. Realizing that what they are about has impacts far beyond name authorities, they have renamed the project the Linked Systems Project. Literally everything they are doing is establishing a basis upon which links for a number of activities can be founded. We are looking forward to linking not only for purposes of exchanging authority information but bibliographic records as well.

I reported to you last time that Carol Mandel had offered to prepare a paper in the area of subject access and how the Bibliographic Service Department Program might effectively perform in that area, how it might stimulate activity that was required. That document was prepared, with the assistance of Judith Herschman. It has been discussed a number of times at the Program Committee level, and several elements of that document are now being carefully studied for implementation. The report is available now from the Council and if you would like a copy, I would be happy to provide it to you.

In the area of bibliographic products and services, the online public access catalog evaluation project is the major activity of the program. Phase I, which was just barely under way the last time I reported to you, is now largely completed. That activity was a cooperative effort among RLG, OCLC, UTLAS, the University of California Division of Library Automation, the Library of Congress, and a private contractor. They have successfully designed data collection instruments, questionnaires, and interview forms. The preliminary testing of those forms has been completed, and part of Phase II, which is now under way, is indeed a pilot test of those instruments. Data collection began this week at Northwestern, I believe, at several other sites. The Library of Congress is underway. Indeed, data will be collected at over 30 institutions and at 75 or more sites. That includes branches of large university libraries. Phase III of that project, literally buried in Phase II, is the machine analysis of the collected data. The University of California Division of Library Automation has received a grant to perform that service, and the definition of research questions to be resolved by the data is under way. Preliminary results, that is, results of the pilot project, will be discussed at a pre-Midwinter Meeting in Denver on January 21. Detailed information about that meeting will be provided

later. We will be looking at the reports for the very first time. Detailed analysis will not, obviously, have been done by then.

Just a brief mention of the Rush-Stevens report. Many of you have seen copies of it, and some of you have been in a position to respond to that document. It is a document prepared by James Rush and Norman Stevens on the role of regional networks in a nationwide bibliographic record service. It is a draft document at the moment. The last day we are officially receiving responses to it is tomorrow. It is unclear when the resulting document will be released, but we have had responses from a number of state libraries. They all had copies of it. All of the regional networks received copies and were encouraged to discuss it with their governing boards. I suppose we have 35 or 40 responses right now.

Within the next six months we expect our activity will continue in the area of telecommunications standards, clearly in the name authority file project, name authorities generally, and, as I suggested earlier, in the area of subjects. And, of course, we will probably be close to concluding the data collection activities in the online public access catalogue project by the next time we speak.

The BSDP Program Committee continues to meet and provide valuable guidance to us. It has added a new member. Joan Gottwals from the University of Pennsylvania. It is at the moment hard to understand the changing landscape in which this whole project exists and how best the program can respond to that landscape as it changes. If there are any questions, I would be delighted to answer them. Otherwise, thank you very much.

MR. LUCKER: Thank you, Lee.

Report of the ARL President

MR. LUCKER: This is the final report. As Shirley said to me in an aside, Presidents have to get used to speaking to empty rooms. But I appreciate, those of you who are staying, that you are staying. This will not be an extensive report.

First, however, I would like to take a moment to do something which I consider both a pleasure and an honor. This meeting today represents the last meeting for three ARL directors—one of whom has the record for longevity in a single library, the others are also long-term ARL directors. Robert Blackburn, University Librarian, University of Toronto, will be stepping down as University Librarian at the end of this year, although he will stay on at the University for another two years doing some writing and research. Bob clearly is the longest-serving ARL Director, having attended his first ARL meeting, according to my records, in 1948. Leslie Dunlap, Director of Libraries at University of Iowa, will also be stepping down from his position at the end of this year, making this his last meeting as well. Les has been in his position, according to our records, since 1958—23 years. John Gribbin Director of Libraries at the University of Missouri in Columbia, will also be retiring from his position in February 1982. John has been an ARL director for 14 years, first at Tulane University, which joined the Association in 1967, then at the University of Missouri. Certainly these are three of the longest-serving directors, all of whom have contributed a great deal to the Association. I hope you will join

me in congratulating them on all they have done and wishing them good luck in the years ahead.

I would now like to review briefly with you the actions taken by the Board of Directors at the meetings held on Wednesday and Thursday. These are things that you will read about in the ARL Newsletter, but I thought as a reward for staying, you might get some news before everybody else.

The Board heard a brief report on an experiment that was conducted over the summer, not necessarily by design, but by force. Because of the air traffic controllers strike, the Executive Committee, which normally meets during the summer, could not meet in Washington, and therefore we agreed to try conducting our meeting by conference call. Because many agenda items could be taken care of by mail, the number of items was reduced and the conference call was held in August, at a total cost to the Association of $250, which is certainly far less than the air fare for the committee. We found it was a useful experiment, and we may decide to do it again.

The Board approved the appointment of a financial trustee in the D.C. area. The staff believes that in the event that the two staff members who can sign payroll checks, namely the Executive Director and the Associate Executive Director, were not available—the thought came to them while flying to Minneapolis in the fog—we need to have somebody in the area who could sign payroll checks for the support staff in an emergency. The Board agreed that a representative of an ARL institution in the Washington area should be found who could fill that role.

At the suggestion of the President of ARL, the Board agreed that we should clean up the sexist language in the ARL Bylaws, which consists primarily of "he's", "himself's" and so on, and Sterling Albrecht has agreed to take on the responsibility.

The Board heard also a report from Joe Treyz regarding the work of the Collection Development Task Force. The task force is beginning a feasibility test for building a clearinghouse or data base of information on collection strengths in ARL libraries. The data base, which would be a major reference and decision-making tool in itself, would also serve as the basis for shared collection development and preservation decisions among ARL libraries and on a North American basis through an ARL program which might be developed. Five libraries have agreed to participate in a pilot test: Iowa State, Cincinnati, Wisconsin, Manitoba, and Notre Dame. The first three are represented on the task force by their directors. Manitoba brings a Canadian perspective, and Notre Dame was selected because it recently completed a CAP project. The test will use an instrument now being used by RLG libraries, which is based in large part on work previously done by the Resources and Technical Services Division of ALA. The task force expects to be well along in its work by spring and ready to report to the membership in May.

The Collection Development Task Force has decided and the Board agreed to delay reporting on the Foreign Acquisitions Committees until it sees whether the clearinghouse project will affect the need for such committees. As you know, the Board asked the task force to look at the area committees to recommend what the future of these committees ought to be and what kind of role they ought to play. And now it seems, because of this work in collection development, that there may

be another role for the area groups, so the Board has agreed to hold off on any decision regarding these subcommittees until after the pilot test takes place.

The Board discussed the question of whether we should look at the matter of interlibrary loan charges again to see what needs to be done in the way of at least bringing up-to-date the data on which ARL libraries are charging for interlibrary loan and what change has taken place in this area in the last few years. The Board asked the Interlibrary Loan Committee to:

1. assess the current situation regarding interlibrary loan charges among ARL members, i.e., essentially to update the 1976-77 survey on ILL charges.

2. investigate what special agreements among consortia and other networks exist in which ARL libraries participate with regard to charging or not charging.

3. see what data are available about patterns of borrowing among ARL libraries.

We are not proposing that the Committee develop a broad survey questionnaire, but really just see what they can do in the way of fact-finding with a minimal amount of effort.

The Board discussed the matter of federal relations in ARL and asked the staff to prepare a paper outlining possible levels of activity that ARL might engage in with regard to federal legislation to help the Board consider the question of staffing and appropriate action for ARL at the winter meeting of the Board.

The Board voted to discontinue the Foreign Acquisitions Newsletter (FAN), with no further plans for a similar publication. This was done for economic reasons, since the market survey which was undertaken indicated that the membership does not want to continue subsidizing FAN, and that there was not enough marketability for the publication to be produced on a no-cost-to-ARL basis. The last time FAN was published, which was about two years ago, the net cost to ARL, not including staff time, was $6,000 per year. The money is not in this year's budget, so we are not cutting $6,000 from the budget. But, on the other hand, deciding not to publish it means we do not have to find $6,000.

The Board voted to proceed with arrangements to transfer the final responsibility for the Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project to the Center for Research Libraries. ARL has had no direct responsibility for the project for many years, and the Center has been operating it for a long time. Donald Simpson and the CRL staff have prepared a proposal outlining how the project would continue if transferred to CRL. The ARL Board approved the plans and it will be considered by the CRL Board at their meeting in November. If the transfer were not to take place, the project would continue as it is currently operating.

Finally, the Board discussed ways to stimulate more direct membership involvement in ARL, to provide mechanisms by which all directors participate in the decision-making and policy-making processes. Some of the motivation for this might be clear from this afternoon's agenda, which is crowded and does not allow

much time for discussion. After substantial discussion, the Board decided to experiment with a new format at the next few meetings, beginning in May 1982. The experiment basically will divide the ARL Business Meeting into two separate sessions. The first will be a "members only" meeting: this will be a meeting designed to discuss ARL programs, budgets, commitments, priorities without the pressure of a series of scheduled reports and outside speakers and guests. This session would be open only to ARL directors and designated alternates, and possibly only the Executive Director. There would also be, however, at each meeting what we call a reports session, including timely and provocative reports from our own committees and task forces, and all of the people with whom we work so closely and from whom we absolutely have to hear. But we will keep these two meetings separate. This we do not see as the answer to all our problems. Rather, we see this is another step in an evolutionary process of trying to get more member/director participation, more communication with the Board as to what is on people's minds in a setting that we believe will be conducive to frank and open exchange.

With that in mind, I can report to you briefly on the plans for the May 1982 meeting. As most of you know at this time, 1982 represents the 50th year of the existence of the Association of Research Libraries, which was founded in 1932. It also turns out that the May 1982 meeting is the 100th meeting of the Association. If you believe in astrology, there has got to be something mystical about this, but probably it is very simple mathematics. At any rate, the meeting has been scheduled for Scottsdale, Arizona. The Program Committee has been formed, which I have agreed to chair. The other members of the Program Committee are: Donald Riggs, Arizona State; Louis Martin, Cornell; and Charles Osburn, Cincinnati.

I will just review briefly the general idea of what we have in mind, and we would be happy to receive suggestions and comments. Basically we are planning four meeting sessions. Following the Board's decision, there will be a "members only" meeting on Wednesday afternoon, May 5, followed by a cocktail party-buffet for all meeting attendees. The evening will be free. (We also believe it is important at ARL Meetings to have plently of unscheduled time for people to get together; one of the most valuable aspects of coming to ARL Meetings is what I call the corridor conversations and informal get-togethers.) The first program session on Thursday morning will focus on ARL itself, celebrating our 50th anniversary. There will be a reports meeting Thursday afternoon, then the second program session on Friday morning. This session will address changes in academic disciplines and the resulting impact upon libraries. Finally, in addition to the business and program meetings, we are planning to have a number of recreational activities and tours, including an informal dinner on Thursday evening rather than a formal banquet. If anybody has any ideas or suggestions, we would be glad to hear them. We believe it will be a very interesting and enjoyable meeting to commemorate ARL's anniversary.

That basically finishes the substantive part of my report. Shirley suggested that I report on my accomplishments as President during the last year, and I said there was really notning to report on, because all I see the President really doing is making sure things keep moving. And I think you can see from what has gone on here today that things in ARL are moving.

I can say that I am very pleased with one accomplishment during my presidency, and that was the appointment of Shirley Echelman as the Executive Director. I was delighted that we were able to get her to come to ARL. I want to

express my deep appreciation to Eldred Smith and the other members of the Search Committee for all their help. It has been a great pleasure working with Shirley and I think you can see from today that she has quickly taken hold of the Association.

Finally, I would just like to thank all of you. I would like to thank the directors of the libraries for all of their assistance and cooperation. I can say that whenever I asked anybody to do anything—to serve on a committee to be on a task force, to do something—not a single person refused during the past year, which I think is remarkable, and I am very grateful. I am also grateful to the Board. I have had an excellent Board during my term. And I should say that as of last night three members of the Board finished their terms: Irene Hoadley, James Wyatt, and Margot McBurney. I am also grateful to Penny Abell and Irene Hoadley who also served on the Executive Committee. I also want to thank the ARL staff—Shirley, Mandi, and Nicky particularly. They have been most helpful. I can tell you, the ARL presidency is time-consuming, but it would be impossible without the kind of support I have received from the staff. Finally for the record, I have to thank the Associate Director of the MIT Libraries, Susan Cote, for being there so much when I was conducting ARL business.

With this, I conclude my report and, as is the tradition in ARL turn the gavel, which is symbolic of the presidency, over to Penny Abell, incoming President.

MS. ABELL: Thank you, Jay. In accordance with longstanding ARL precedent—and because Jay allocated only 120 seconds—I will forego this opportunity to present an inaugural address.

There is another long tradition in ARL from which I will not part. At this point, as you know, typically in an organization the incoming president thanks the outgoing president, regardless of how ineffective the rascal has been. In this particular instance, however, I can express to Jay Lucker our genuine appreciation and admiration for his leadership. As many of you know from direct personal experience, Jay has been extraordinarily open, objective, and patient in hearing individual concerns and, whenever possible, in being responsive. For two years I have closely observed him on the Board as he has sought to represent and address the common concerns of the research library community and to further open the process of ARL decision making. Evidence of the latter is the increasing amount and timeliness of Association fiscal information which is made available to the membership; another example is the proposed membership-only meeting for this spring. His is a model I shall try to emulate. On behalf of all of us, thank you, Jay.

Now on behalf of the Board I want to ask each of you for your continuing help. We work best when we know your concerns and are tapping your energy and ideas. You are responsible for the maintenance of a lively and effective organization, and I look forward to working with you.

Is there any new business to come before the Association? If there is no further business, I declare the 99th Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries adjourned.

APPENDIX - A

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

ARL MEMBERSHIP MEETING

OCTOBER 30, 1981

The agenda for today's business meeting contains a number of items of great importance to the membership of ARL. In the interest of keeping the meeting as short as possible, and of providing as much time as possible for discussion and deliberation, I am departing from tradition by presenting a written report.

There has been a substantial amount of activity at the ARL Office in the last six months. Much of it has been reported via the ARL Newsletter, and I have not included extensive reports on those items. If you are interested in any particular item which has been reported in the Newsletter or in legislative updates you have received, or if you have any questions or comments about this report, I would be delighted to respond as best I can.

Legislation

First, a brief review of legislative activity here in Washington. Since the first of May, the staff at ARL has spent about one-fourth of its time on various legislative issues. Our activities fall into several categories. We maintain contact with a number of congressional staff members, in order to keep ourselves current on what is actually happening with specific pieces of legislation. This contact is supplemented with information from the ALA Washington Office, the Library of Congress, and other sources. Major issues during this period included the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act which passed the Congress in early July, the Library of Congress budget, authorizations and appropriations for Title II-C of the Higher Education Act, and funding for the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) and National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), oversight hearings for the renewal of the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), and hearings (to be held on November 10) on legislation to reform the 1969 Tax Code to allow artists and writers to take a tax deduction on donations of manuscript materials to libraries. In addition to these major concerns, we have addressed ourselves to several other issues, including a move by one of the more conservative members of the House of Representatives to delete from the LC budget the specific amount to have been used for the inclusion of the textual material from Playboy Magazine in the braille publications program.

Varying techniques are used with each issue depending on the status of the legislation, who needs to be approached, and in what way. We have employed the ARL legislative network to good effect, I think. In some cases, we have corresponded with the entire network by memo or mailgram; in others we have targeted specific library directors for help in approaching representatives on specific issues.

As careful readers of the ARL Newsletter and the ALA Washington Newsletter know, programs of interest to research libraries have not fared too badly, considering the general atmosphere in Washington these days. That is not to say that we have any cause for rejoicing, but only that we do not need to don sackcloth and ashes at present. Funding level details can be found in both newsletters. Because of the general confusion about the way authorization and appropriations bills were handled this year, ARL has spent less time than in the past on appropriations for specific items. Instead, the concentration has been on the whole range of issues and on specific items only as they came to the attention of the Congress. For example, just prior to the congressional summer recess we discovered wording in the omnibus budget reconciliation measures which would have had a very serious effect on the ability of library schools in those universities which also have libraries eligible for II-C grants to obtain grants under Title II-B. Working closely with the American Association of Library Schools and ALA, we achieved a "technical amendment" to the legislative wording. However, the issue may be moot since it now appears that there will be no appropriation for Title II-B.

In September, the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education held oversight hearings on the Library Services and Construction Act. The ARL Office prepared testimony on the usefulness of this Act and on participation by research libraries in programs funded under the Act, and we enlisted Ralph McCoy's help in presenting the testimony. He was, as you would expect, a very successful testifier.

We learned three weeks ago that the Senate Subcommittee on Estate and Gift Taxation will hold hearings on three bills addressing the issue of donations of manuscript materials to libraries and archives. We prepared testimony on the bills from material provided by several ARL libraries. Roscoe Rouse will testify on ARL's behalf on November 10.

On the braille Playboy issue, we were able to mobilize several ARL directors with very strong commitments to intellectual freedom issues and have had a positive response from congressional quarters to this effort.

Five-Year Copyright Review

The five-year copyright review has recently surfaced for attention. On September 16, David Ladd, Register of Copyright, held a meeting to discuss how the outstanding issues should be addressed, and how the review will proceed. The King report, scheduled for completion in March 1982, is under way; but Mr. Ladd desires to hold a meeting or series of meetings with all sides on the copyright issue prior to next March to see if some agreement can be forged on some of the outstanding issues. After attending this meeting, I consulted with ARL's counsel and with ARL President Jay Lucker. We decided to form an informal working group on this issue (to include Penny Abell, ARL President-elect; John McDonald, chair of the Joint Committee on Expanded Access to Journals; Carlton Rochell, chair of the Federal Relations Committee; and Kenneth Peterson, chair of the Interlibrary Loan Committee.) At a meeting yesterday afternoon, we discussed several issues outlined by Mr. Ladd as potential agenda items for a meeting the Copyright Office will hold on November 19. Strategies for the library community are now being discussed by all participating organizations.

ARL Microform Project

The ARL Microform Project is well under way. The Council on Library Resources provided us with a $20,000 start-up grant, so we were able to hire Jeffrey Heynen as Project Coordinator in mid-August. Jeffrey began work on a part-time basis, but has actually been working almost full-time on the project. We have recently received a grant from the Mellon Foundation for $53,000 so that the project is now fully funded. I would like to take this opportunity to thank Mellon Program Director James Morris for his interest in the project and for his clear understanding of its potential import.

At the same time as work began at ARL, the University of Utah and Indiana and Stanford Universities were ready to begin large microform cataloging programs, funded under Title II-C. Profile-matching (or the capability of obtaining records for individual title on a set by set rather than title by title basis) was considered a major but distant and difficult goal for the ARL project. The opportunity of having three projects under way which would benefit greatly from profile-matching was too great to forgo. Therefore, discussions began almost immediately, first with OCLC and then with RLG, to see whether profile-matching mechanisms could be established quickly enough so that they could be used by these projects should they wish to take advantage of them. Several aspects, some of which are significant and some less so, have yet to be arranged; but, surprisingly, it seems that profile-matching is a goal well within sight. Specifically, OCLC has committed itself to provide profile-matching for the microform cataloging projects which are being done via OCLC. This should be accomplished by the end of 1981. Discussions with RLG are proceeding along similar lines. Thus, we appear to be very close to accomplishing one of the major and more difficult goals of the program after only two and a half months of work.

The project's correspondence load has been heavy; the news release describing the beginning of the project generated an extensive response. The Project Office has received letters and phone calls from ARL and non-ARL libraries, and from microform publishers, historical societies, archives, and representatives of library groups. Some of these people are interested in cooperative cataloging, some in individual efforts, and many have not yet established a preference. The interest appears to be evenly distributed geographically across North America, and ranges from the cataloging of microform sets, to the bibliographic control of preservation microfilm masters, to control of microform publications produced by the inquiring agency.

Both American and foreign microform publishers have shown interest in producing machine readable cataloging for library use, in assisting libraries to catalog previously published sets, and in general cooperation toward achieving the project's goals. Everyone seems eager to participate in this project. We have set up a file management system to keep people informed on an ongoing basis. In addition, work has begun on other aspects of the project, such as advance distribution of LC microform cataloging policy, and assistance in establishing standard descriptions and use and policy for implementing of the physical description field within the MARC format. Work is also progressing on the mechanisms and agreements that are needed for the bibliographic utilities to share microform cataloging information among themselves. Coordination of cooperative cataloging programs is beginning with a meeting later this afternoon, which has been arranged by David Laird and

Roger Hanson. Over 20 ARL libraries have expressed interest in participating. A brochure explaining the project's goals is in preparation, as are several articles and short reports for the ARL Newsletter and other media sources. An information clearinghouse for cataloging activities is being established to help libraries select microform sets for cataloging, find partners for possible cooperative ventures, and use most effectively the work that has already been done. The clearinghouse is based on data from the surveys done during the Information Systems Consultants, Inc. (ISCI) planning study. This work will be extended by conducting new surveys of libraries and microform publishers.

ARL Liaison to SAA

Herbert Finch, ARL's liaison to the Society for American Archivists (SAA), has reported that, after several years of discussion and experimentation, a concerted movement is now forming to place the nation's archival and manuscript resources into information networks. SAA formed a task force on national information systems in 1977. This task force, composed of ten archivists representing federal, state, university, and private institutions, is chaired by Richard Lytle, archivist of the Smithsonian Institution. David Bearman is project director and the project is assisted by an advisory committee of information scientists. Upon receipt of an NEH grant in 1980, the task force began to meet regularly to outline the basic needs of the system. It has now formed a working group including LC, the National Archives, RLG, and NHPRC participants. It is expected that the task force will produce a general format designed to support the exchange of descriptive information among repositories and/or bibliographic utilities.

Herb also reported that the OCLC advisory task force on manuscripts recommended substantive modifications of system capabilities for manuscripts in 1979, but few have been adopted. In 1981, again with NEH support, RLG appointed a task force on special formats to advise Yale University on its manuscript cataloging project and to develop an RLIN format for machine readable cataloging of archives and manuscripts. It will submit a functional requirements report with specifications for the development of an RLIN format by the end of this year.

ARL/AAAH Project

This joint effort to expand and enhance the communications lines between faculty members and research libraries is proceeding at a moderate but sure pace. Funded by a grant from CLR, three campuses were chosen for a test of the effects of regular distribution of a newsletter on research library issues to faculty. The directors of the libraries at Princeton, Colorado, and North Carolina are distributing copies of Library Issues, and have committed themselves to extensive follow-up with faculty members. An evaluation of the test will take place at the end of the 1981-82 academic year.

Staff has begun to contact scholarly societies to explore improved communications mechanisms. The most positive result of this effort to date is a continuing discussion with the American Political Science Association about the possibility of cooperation on a new edition of their guide to library use for political scientists.

1982 Budget

The 1982 Budget for ARL was mailed to all members on September 24. After reviewing the third quarter report, we prepared an alternate budget based on the magnitude of the interest income line. This alternate budget is available for your information and discussion. It presents, for your consideration, an alternate dues increase proposal ($300 or + 10 percent).

Summary

In summary, I would like to thank all of you for responding positively whenever you were called upon to write letters to legislators, serve on committees, supply information, or serve the Association in other ways. Also, I appreciate your continued patience in educating me about what you think about the important issues for research libraries. The staff and I are gratified at the expressions of reinforcement for and commitment to ARL that we receive from each of you every time we talk together.

Shirley Echelman
Executive Director

APPENDIX - B

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ARL COMMITTEE ON INTERLIBRARY LOAN 1980-81

During 1980-81 the ARL Committee on Interlibrary Loan considered the following matters.

Interlibrary Loan Code. One year has passed since the revised ILL Code was adopted by the American Library Association and put into use. Based upon general observations and some informal inquiries, it appears the revised code has been accepted and implemented by ARL member libraries without major difficulties. The committee continues to have representation on the ALA/Reference and Adult Services Division (RASD) Interlibrary Loan Committee where overall reactions to the revised code likewise indicate that changes have proven workable. Plans are moving forward, with the ALA/RASD committee, for ALA to prepare and publish a revised ILL Manual. Virginia Boucher from the University of Colorado library is currently working on this project.

Copyright. The matter of presenting testimony at the hearings conducted by the Register of Copyrights was considered. The committee was in communication with the ALA Office for Research and suggested that ARL and ALA coordinate efforts for a survey related to the five-year review of the 1976 Copyright Law. When it was subsequently learned that the Copyright Office was planning to contract for a comprehensive survey, the ALA Office of Research indicated it would not also plan for survey activities. Meanwhile, both the ALA Executive Director and the chairperson of the ALA Legislative Committee's Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Copyright did provide testimony. Because ARL libraries had not reported major problems related to copyright regulations, and in light of testimony presented by other library associations, the ARL Committee on Interlibrary Loan decided to wait until the Copyright Office's survey was completed in order to determine the issues or possible changes that would need to be addressed. Copies of the survey instruments were received and have been reviewed by members of the committee. It is the opinion of the committee that the burden of proof is upon the publishers to show evidence that the 1976 Copyright Law has been abused by libraries or that it has had detrimental effects upon the publishing industry. Through the ARL Office, the committee remains in contact with the CNLIA Ad Hoc Committee on Copyright Law Practice and Implementation in order to keep informed about progress in the survey being conducted for the Copyright Office by King Research, Inc.

Sterling J. Albrecht
H. Gordon Bechanan
Bernard Kreissman
Glenora Rossell
Kenneth G. Peterson, Chairperson

October 1981

APPENDIX - C

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARL STATISTICS 1980-81

This fiscal year saw the publication of two reports with which the committee has been concerned for some time. Kendon Stubbs of the University of Virginia authored both reports. The first is The ARL Library Index and Quantitative Relationships in the ARL. In it Mr. Stubbs provides a lucid explanation of factor analysis as applied to ARL data. This method of analysis has taken on added significance since its adoption by ARL as one of the principal criteria for membership.

In the second report, Cumulated ARL University Library Statistics, 1962-63 through 1978-79, Mr. Stubbs shared authorship with David Buxton. This compilation should be a valuable resource to researchers, administrators, and the library community in studying university research libraries. The data are available both in book form and magnetic tape. The ARL Office hopes to encourage the use of these data by external agents, especially library schools. Only modest changes were made in the annual cumulations of ARL statistics and the salary survey. However, the change in the salary survey forms, now compiled by Gordon Fretwell of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, not only makes filling out the forms easier for most respondents but also permits more extensive analysis than ever before. This year the committee will be looking at salary and rank patterns and hopes to issue a report on that. (Further suggestions are welcome.)

The committee believes that significant changes in the present data collection patterns are not warranted at this time so it plans none for the immediate future. However, the measurement and management of library functions remains a pressing concern. Consequently, the committee has decided to turn its attention to performance measures. This year the members of the committee intend to test several types of performance measures in their libraries. If successful, we hope next year to interest other ARL libraries in participating in the development of performance measures on a voluntary basis. To that end we would welcome any expressions of willingness to participate in such a venture that any ARL library wishes to make.

Kendon Stubbs
Anne Woodsworth
Richard Talbot, Chairperson

October 1981

APPENDIX - D

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE
MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE ON NONACADEMIC LIBRARIES
1980-81

The committee met during the May 1981 Meeting of the Association and there was discussion and agreement on the following points.

- While it would be preferable to have a statistical approach for determining membership for nonacademic libraries similar to the one currently used for academic libraries, this does not appear to be possible because of the difference in statistics among the nonacademic members of the ARL. However, this problem is being studied by Kendon Stubbs and a report will be available at the committee's next meeting in October.

- If a statistical approach is not possible, criteria will be presented that insure that new member libraries will share the principal interests and problems of the academic members of ARL. A draft of proposed criteria will be reviewed at the October meeting.

- The Independent Research Libraries Association (IRLA) has 15 members, four of which are also members of ARL. Other members of IRLA may be eligible under the new criteria. The Committee will review that possibility along with the others such as an associate relationship between the IRLA and ARL.

- It was recommended to the Board that the name of the committee be changed to Membership Committee on Nonuniversity Libraries.

Margaret Beckman
William S. Budington
Robert Maloy
Robert C. Miller
Roy L. Kidman, Chairperson

September 1981

APPENDIX - E

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ARL TASK FORCE ON BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL 1980-81

The task force continued its liaison with the Library of Congress and served as a sounding-board for LC in its consideration of several new policies. Of those, the task force brought to the attention of the Association's membership LC's proposal for providing GPO publications in microform only and its inquiry as to a preference for the same quantity of cataloging with less fullness of record or for fewer titles with the same fullness of record. At the behest of LC, the task force also recommended to the ARL Board of Directors that they pass a resolution recommending to the International Federation of Library and Information Associations (IFLA) that changes in the International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD) be kept to a minimum. In addition, it continued to receive regular reports on the progress of the Association's Microform Project and on the CONSER project.

The task force has retained its basic concern with cataloging costs and management's participation in decisions governing cataloging policy. In line with that concern, the task force recommended to the Board of Directors of the Resources and Technical Services Division (RTSD) of the American Library Association that no major change in cataloging standards and requirements be passed without an accompanying cost impact study. The RTSD Board turned the matter over to the RTSD Technical Services Costs Committee, which is responding by developing a set of questions about possible impact of a proposed change to be answered before that change is recommended for adoption. From these and other discussions, the task force has identified the need for each library to develop a unified point of view—including perspectives from both managerial and technical staff—when it addresses questions on cataloging standards, LC policies, and other national policy issues in bibliographic control. The task force intends to encourage ARL directors to devise means within each individual library to meet this need.

The latter part of the year was devoted to the study of possible simplifications of the MARC format. Ms. D. Kaye Gapen produced a commissioned paper on the subject, which the task force is continuing to study.

During the year, David Bishop, Director of Libraries at the University of Georgia, replaced Ake Koel as a member of the task force.

David Bishop
Merle N. Boylan
Joseph H. Howard
Joseph Rosenthal
James F. Govan, Chairperson

October 1981

APPENDIX - F

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ARL TASK FORCE ON COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT 1980-81

Early in 1981, the ARL Task Force on Collection Development was established with the following membership: Hendrik Edelman, John Finzi, Warren Kuhn, Charles Osburn, Marianne Scott, and Joseph Treyz, Chairman. The task force has held two meetings, one at the ARL Meeting in New York in May, the other at the ALA Conference in San Francisco in June. Minutes of the meetings are available if desired.

Discussion is well under way on the current commitment of ARL as an association to the area of foreign acquisitions, including the role of the ARL Foreign Acquisitions Committees. In a closely-related matter, a survey is currently being conducted to assess the need for and feasibility of continuing the publication of the Foreign Acquisition Newsletter (FAN) and the possibility of incorporating LC Acquisition Trends (now distributed free-of-charge) as a separate section in FAN. The task force plans to report on foreign acquisition concerns to the ARL Board of Directors in May 1982.

Information on the changes in the system of scholarly communication is being gathered and the activities of various councils and associations, such as the American Association of Universities (AAU), the National Council on Foreign Languages and International Studies, and the American Association for the Advancement of the Humanities, are being studied in this area.

To assess possible approaches to national cooperation in building and maintaining in-depth collections in specialized areas, the task force is working on a survey of collection strength and weakness in ARL libraries. The information gathered should help in coordinating collection development and resource sharing programs and in assessing the feasibility of developing a formal ARL plan. The task force expects to work closely with the AAU/Council on Library Resources Task Force on Resource Sharing and other interested outside groups.

Hendrick Edelman
John Finzi
Warren Kuhn
Charles Osburn
Marianne Scott
Joseph H. Treyz, Chairperson

September 28, 1981

APPENDIX - G

ATTENDANCE AT 99TH MEMBERSHIP MEETING
WASHINGTON, D.C.
October 29-30, 1981

University of Alabama Libraries
D. Kaye Gapen

University of Alberta Library
Bruce Peel

University of Arizona Library
W. David Laird

Arizona State University Library
Donald Riggs

Boston Public Library
Philip J. McNiff

Boston University Library
John Laucus

Brigham Young University Library
Sterling J. Albrecht

University of British Columbia Library
Doug McInnes

Brown University Library
Lawrence J. Kipp

University of California, Berkeley Library
Joseph Rosenthal

University of California, Davis Library
Bernard Kreissman

University of California, Irvine Library
Calvin J. Boyer

University of California, Los Angeles Library
Dan Tonkery

University of California, Riverside Library
Joan Chambers

University of California, San Diego Library
Millicent D. Abell

University of California, Santa Barbara Library
Allen B. Veaner

Case Western Reserve University Libraries
Not represented

Center for Research Libraries
Donald B. Simpson

University of Chicago Library
Martin D. Runkle

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Charles B. Osburn

University of Colorado Library
Clyde Walton

Colorado State University Library
Le Moyne W. Anderson

Columbia University Libraries
Merrily E. Taylor

University of Connecticut Library
John P. McDonald

Cornell University Libraries
Louis E. Martin

Dartmouth College Libraries
Margaret A. Otto

Duke University Libraries
Elvin E. Strowd

Emory University Library
Herbert F. Johnson

University of Florida Libraries
Gustave A. Harrer

Florida State University Library
Fred Jones

Georgetown University Library
Joseph E. Jeffs

University of Georgia Libraries
David F. Bishop

University of Guelph Library
Not represented

Harvard University Library
Y. T. Feng

University of Hawaii Library
Gary MacMillian

University of Houston Libraries
Robin Downes

Howard University Libraries
Binford Conley

University of Illinois Library
Hugh Atkinson

Indiana University Libraries
Elaine F. Sloan

University of Iowa Libraries
Leslie W. Dunlap

Iowa State University Library
Warren B. Kuhn

John Crerar Library
William S. Budington

Johns Hopkins University Library
Susan K. Martin

University of Kansas Library
H. Robert Malinowsky

University of Kentucky Libraries
Paul A. Willis

Kent State University Libraries
Hyman W. Kritzer

Library of Congress
William Welsh

Linda Hall Library
Thomas D. Gillies

Louisiana State University Library
D. W. Schneider

McGill University Library
Marianne Scott

McMaster University Library
Graham R. Hill

University of Manitoba Libraries
Marilyn J. Sharrow

University of Maryland Library
H. Joanne Harrar

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Richard Talbot

Massachusetts Inst. of Technology Libs.
Jay K. Lucker

University of Miami Library
Frank Rodgers

University of Michigan Library
Richard M. Dougherty

Michigan State University Library
Not represented

University of Minnesota Libraries
Eldred Smith

University of Missouri Library
John Gribbin

National Agricultural Library
Richard Farley

National Library of Canada
Hope Clement

National Library of Medicine
Harold Schoolman

University of Nebraska Libraries
Not represented

The Newberry Library
Not represented

University of New Mexico Library
Paul Vassallo

New York Public Library
David H. Stam

New York State Library
Peter Paulson

New York University Libraries
Carlton C. Rochell

University of North Carolina Libraries
James F. Govan

Northwestern University Libraries
John P. McGowan

University of Notre Dame Libraries
Robert C. Miller

Ohio State University Libraries
William J. Studer

University of Oklahoma Library
Not represented

Oklahoma State University Library
Roscoe Rouse

University of Oregon Library
Not represented

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Richard De Gennaro

Pennsylvania State University Library
Stuart Forth

University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Glenora E. Rossell

Princeton University Library
Donald Koepp

Purdue University Library
Joseph M. Dagnese

Queen's University Library
Margot B. McBurney

Rice University Library
Samuel Carrington

University of Rochester Libraries
James F. Wyatt

Rutgers University Library
Hendrik Edelman

University of Saskatchewan Library
Nancy A. Brown

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Robert Maloy

University of South Carolina Library
Kenneth E. Toombs

University of Southern Calif. Library
Roy L. Kidman

Southern Illinois University Library
Kenneth G. Peterson

Stanford University Libraries
David C. Weber

State University of New York at Albany
Joseph Z. Nitecki

State University of New York at Buffalo
Saktidas Roy

State University of New York at Stony Brook
John B. Smith

Syracuse University Libraries
Donald C. Anthony

Temple University Library
Joseph Boisse

University of Tennessee Libraries
Donald R. Hunt

University of Texas Libraries
Not represented

Texas A & M University Library
Irene B. Hoadley

University of Toronto Libraries
Robert Blackburn

Tulane University Library
William Newman

University of Utah Libraries
Roger K. Hanson

Vanderbilt University Library
Frank P. Grisham

Virginia Polytechnic Inst. & State Univ.
H. Gordon Bechanan

University of Virginia Libraries
Ray Frantz

University of Washington Library
Not represented

Washington State University Library
Not represented

Washington University Libraries
Charles Churchwell

Wayne State University Libraries
Vern M. Pings

University of Western Ontario Library
Not represented

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Joseph Treyz

Yale University Libraries
Donald Engley

York University Libraries
Anne Woodsworth

ATTENDANCE BY THE MEMBERSHIP - NAME INDEX

Abell, Millicent D.	University of California, San Diego Library
Albrecht, Sterling J.	Brigham Young University Library
Anderson, Le Moyne W.	Colorado State University Library
Anthony, Donald C.	Syracuse University Libraries
Atkinson, Hugh	University of Illinois Library
Bechanan, H. Gordon	Virginia Polytechnic Inst. & State Univ. Lib.
Bishop, David F.	University of Georgia Libraries
Blackburn, Robert	University of Toronto Libraries
Boisse, Joseph	Temple University Library
Boyer, Calvin J.	University of California, Irvine Library
Brown, Nancy A.	University of Saskatchewan Library
Budington, William S.	John Crerar Library
Carrington, Samuel	Rice University Library
Chambers, Joan	University of California, Riverside Library
Churchwell, Charles	Washington University Libraries
Clement, Hope	National Library of Canada
Conley, Binford	Howard University Libraries
Dagnese, Joseph M.	Purdue University Library
De Gennaro, Richard	University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Dougherty, Richard M.	University of Michigan Library
Downes, Robin	University of Houston Libraries
Dunlap, Leslie W.	University of Iowa Libraries
Edelman, Hendrik	Rutgers University Library
Engley, Donald	Yale University Libraries
Farley, Richard	National Agricultural Library
Feng, Y. T.	Harvard University Library
Forth, Stuart	Pennsylvania State University Library
Frantz, Ray	University of Virginia Libraries
Gapen, D. Kaye	University of Alabama Libraries
Gillies, Thomas D.	Linda Hall Library
Govan, James F.	University of North Carolina Libraries
Gribbin, John	University of Missouri Library
Grisham, Frank P.	Vanderbilt University Library
Hanson, Roger K.	University of Utah Libraries
Harrar, H. Joanne	University of Maryland Library
Harrer, Gustave A.	University of Florida Libraries
Hill, Graham R.	McMaster University Library
Hoadley, Irene B.	Texas A&M University Library
Hunt, Donald R.	University of Tennessee Libraries
Jeffs, Joseph E.	Georgetown University Library

Johnson, Herbert F.	Emory University Library
Jones, Fred	Florida State University Library
Kidman, Roy L.	University of Southern California Library
Kipp, Lawrence J.	Brown University Library
Koepp, Donald	Princeton University Library
Kreissman, Bernard	University of California, Davis Library
Kritzer, Hyman W.	Kent State University Libraries
Kuhn, Warren B.	Iowa State University Library
Laird, W. David	University of Arizona Library
Laucus, John	Boston University Library
Lucker, Jay K.	Massachusetts Institute of Technology Libraries
McBurney, Margot B.	Queen's University Library
McDonald, John P.	University of Connecticut Library
McGowan, John P.	Northwestern University Libraries
McInnes, Doug	University of British Columbia Library
McNiff, Philip J.	Boston Public Library
MacMillian, Gary	University of Hawaii Library
Malinowsky, H. Robert	University of Kansas Library
Maloy, Robert	Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Martin, Louis E.	Cornell University Libraries
Martin, Susan K.	Johns Hopkins University Library
Miller, Robert C.	University of Notre Dame Libraries
Newman, William	Tulane University Library
Nitecki, Joseph Z.	State University of New York at Albany Libraries
Osburn, Charles B.	University of Cincinnati Libraries
Otto, Margaret A.	Dartmouth College Libraries
Paulson, Peter	New York State Library
Peel, Bruce	University of Alberta Library
Peterson, Kenneth G.	Southern Illinois University Library
Pings, Vern M.	Wayne State University Libraries
Riggs, Donald	Arizona State University Library
Rochell, Carlton	New York University Libraries
Rodgers, Frank	University of Miami Library
Rosenthal, Joseph	University of California, Berkeley Library
Rossell, Glenora E.	University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Rouse, Roscoe	Oklahoma State University Library
Roy, Saktidas	State University of New York at Buffalo Libraries
Runkle, Martin D.	University of Chicago Library
Schoolman, Harold	National Library of Medicine
Scott, Marianne	McGill University Library
Sharrow, Marilyn J.	University of Manitoba Libraries
Simpson, Donald B.	Center for Research Libraries
Sloan, Elaine F.	Indiana University Libraries
Smith, Eldred	University of Minnesota Libraries

Smith, John B.	State University of New York at Stony Brook Library
Schneider, D. W.	Louisiana State University Library
Stam, David H.	New York Public Library
Strowd, Elvin E.	Duke University Libraries
Studer, William J.	Ohio State University Libraries
Talbot, Richard	University of Massachusetts Libraries
Taylor, Merrily E.	Columbia University Libraries
Tonkery, Dan	University of California, LOs Angeles Library
Toombs, Kenneth E.	University of South Carolina Library
Treyz, Joseph	University of Wisconsin Libraries
Vassallo, Paul	University of New Mexico Library
Veaner, Allen B.	University of California, Santa Barbara Library
Walton, Clyde	University of Colorado Library
Weber, David C.	Stanford University Libraries
Welsh, William	Library of Congress
Willis, Paul A.	University of Kentucky Libraries
Woodsworth, Anne	York University Libraries
Wyatt James F.	University of Rochester Libraries

ARL Staff

Shirley Echelman, Executive Director
Carol A. Mandel, Associate Executive Director
Nicola Daval, Information Officer
Jeffrey Heynen, ARL Microform Project Coordinator
Duane E. Webster, Director, Office of Management Studies
Jeffrey J. Gardner, Associate, Office of Management Studies
Maureen S. Schechter, Training Program Specialist, Office of Management Studies
Maxine Sitts, Information Services Specialist, Office of Management Studies
Pamela W. Darling, Preservation Specialist, Office of Management Studies

Guests

Page Ackerman	Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of California, Los Angeles
Kenneth Allen	Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, OMB (speaker)
Toni Bearman	National Commission on Libraries & Information Science
Russell Bidlack	School of Library Science, University of Michigan
Susan Brynteson	University of Delaware
Harrison Bryan	National Library of Australia
Harold Cannon	National Endowment for the Humanities
Eileen Cooke	American Library Association
Margaret Child	National Endowment for the Humanities
Ray Fry	Office of Libraries and Learning Technologies, Department of Education
Malcolm Davis	Office of Libraries and Learning Technologies, Department of Education
Matsuko Furuya	University of Toronto Library Automation Systems
Marcella Grendler	National Endowment for the Humanities
Warren Haas	Council on Library Resources
Robert Hayes	Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of California, Los Angeles (speaker)
Dick Hays	Office of Libraries and Learning Technologies, Department of Education
Joseph Howard	Library of Congress
Lee Jones	Council on Library Resources
Anne Le Clerq	CLR Intern - University of California, Los Angeles Library
Thomas Litzenburg	Association of American Universities
Deanna Marcum	Council on Library Resources
Stephen McCarthy	
Patricia McClung	CLR Intern - University of California, Los Angeles Library
Joseph Morehead	School of Library and Information Science, State University of New York-Albany (speaker)
James Neal	CLR Intern - Pennsylvania State University Library
Thomas Noble	American Council of Learned Societies
Kenyon Rosenberg	National Technical Information Science
James Schmidt	Research Libraries Group
Paul Schrank	OCLC, Inc.
Henry Snyder	Louisiana State University (ESTC/NA)
Nettie B. Taylor	
Virginia Toliver	CLR Intern - Washington University Libraries
Robert Willard	Information Industry Association (speaker)
Robert Vosper	Graduate School of Library & Information Science, University of California, Los Angeles
Karen Wittenborg	CLR Intern - Massachusetts Institute of Technology Libraries

APPENDIX - H

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
OFFICERS, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, COMMITTEES, AND TASK FORCES

OCTOBER 1981

ARL OFFICERS AND BOARD FOR 1980/1981

Jay K. Lucker, President
Millicent D. Abell, Vice President & President-Elect
Irene B. Hoadley, Executive Committee Member-at-Large
Sterling J. Albrecht (Oct. 1983)
Charles Churchwell (Oct. 1982)
James F. Govan (Oct. 1983)
Donald Koepp (Oct. 1983)
Margot B. McBurney (Oct. 1981)
Eldred R. Smith (Oct. 1982)
James F. Wyatt (Oct. 1981)

STANDING COMMITTEES

Committee on ARL Statistics

Kendon Stubbs, University of Virginia (1982)
Anne Woodsworth (1982)
Richard J. Talbot, Chairman (1982)

Committee on Interlibrary Loan

H. Gordon Bechanan (1983)
Bernard Kreissman (1983)
Glenora E. Rossell (1982)
Sterling J. Albrecht (1982)
Kenneth G. Peterson, Chairman (1981)

Committee on Preservation of Research Libraries Materials

Joanne Harrar (1981)
David Laird (1982)
Joel L. Samuels (1982)
Clyde Walton (1983)
David H. Stam, Chairman (1982)
Pamela Darling, ex-officio (1981)

Committee on Nominations

*ARL Vice President, Chairman

Federal Relations Committee

Charles Churchwell (1982)
Richard M. Dougherty (1982)
Roger K. Hanson (1983)
Russell Shank (1983)
George W. Shipman (1982)
Carlton C. Rochell, Chairman (1983)

Membership Committee on Nonacademic Libraries

Margaret Beckman (1982)
William S. Budington 1983)
Robert C. Miller (1982)
Robert Maloy (1982)
Roy L. Kidman, Chairman (1983)

ARL/CRL Joint Committee on Expanded Access to Journal Collections

Susan Brynteson, University of Delaware
Richard K. Chapin
* Graham Hill
* Donald Koepp
Elaine Sloan
Richard J. Talbot
* John McDonald, Chairman

* ARL representatives

ARL COMMITTEES ON FOREIGN ACQUISITIONS

Africa

Peter Duignan, Hoover Institution of War, Peace, and Revolution
J.M.D. Crossey, Yale University
Esther J. Walls, SUNY Stony Brook
Julian Witherell, Library of Congress
Hans Panofsky, Northwestern University, Chairman

Middle East

George N. Atiyeh, Library of Congress
James Pollack, University of Indiana
David H. Partington, Harvard University, Chairman

Eastern Europe

Nina Lencek, Columbia University
Laurence Miller, University of Illinois
Joseph A Placek, University of Michigan
Anna Stuliglowa, Cornell University
Wojciech Zalewski, Stanford University
David H. Kraus, Library of Congress, Chairman

East Asia

Weying Wan, University of Michigan
Eugene Wu, Harvard University
Warren Tsuneishi, Library of Congress, Chairman

South Asia

Paul Fasana, New York Public Library
Maureen Patterson, University of Chicago
Louis A. Jacob, Library of Congress, Chairman

Southeast Asia

Charles Bryant, Yale University
John Musgrave, University of Michigan

Latin America

Nettie Lee Benson, University of Texas
Donald Wisdom, Library of Congress
Carl W. Deal, University of Illinois, Chairman

ARL TASK FORCES

Task Force on Bibliographic Control (1983)

David Bishop
Merle N. Boylan
Joseph H. Howard, Library of Congress
Joseph Rosenthal
James F. Govan, Chairman

Task Force on Collection Development (1983)

Hendrik Edelman
John Finzi, Library of Congress
Warren Kuhn
Charles Osburn
Marianne Scott
Joseph Treyz, Chairman

Task Force on Library Education (1982)

Patricia Battin
Irene B. Hoadley
Herbert F. Johnson
James Ranz
Margot B. McBurney, Chairman

Task Force on National Library Network Development (1983)

Harold W. Billings
John P. McGowan
Susan K. Martin
William J. Welsh
William J. Studer, Chairman

REPRESENTATIVES

ALA Committee on Cataloging:
Description and Access. . . . . Carol Mandel
ALA Interlibrary Loan Committee . . . . . .Kenneth Peterson
ALA Joint Statistics Coordinating Committee . . . Carol Mandel
ANSI Committee Z39. . . . . .Shirley Echelman
CONSER Advisory Group . . . . . .Carol Mandel
Eighteenth-Century Short Title Catalogue. . . . . .Ray Frantz
Joint Committee on Union List of Serials . . . . . .William Budington
LC Bibliographic Advisory Committee . . . . . .James Govan
LC Cataloging in Publication Advisory Group . . . . .Carol Mandel
LC Network Advisory Committee . . . . . William Studer
Society of American Archivists. . . . . C. Herbert Finch, Cornell
Universal Serials & Book Exchange . . . . . Joanne Harrar
National Conservation Advisory Committee . . . . . .David Stam
IFLA Standing Committee on Library Buildings
and Equipment . . . . . Roscoe Rouse

CENTER FOR CHINESE RESEARCH MATERIALS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Lloyd E. Eastman, University of Illinois (1981)
Ying-mao Kau, Brown University (1981)
David T. Roy, University of Chicago (1981)
Weiying Wan, University of Michigan (1981)
Eugene Wu, Harvard University (1981)
Philip J. McNiff, Chairman (1981)

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Page Ackerman, UCLA Graduate School of Lib. and Info. Science (1982)
Frank P. Grisham (1981)
Louis E. Martin (1982)
Frank Rodgers (1983)
Martin Runkle (1983)
Irene B. Hoadley, Chairman (1981)

APPENDIX - I

MEMBERSHIP LIST
OCTOBER 1981

University of Alabama Libraries
P.O. Box S
University, Alabama 35486
D. Kaye Gapen, Dean of Univ. Librs.- designate
(205) 348-5298

University of Alberta Library
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2JB
Bruce Peel, Libn. to the Univ.
(403) 432-3790

University of Arizona Library
Tucson, Arizona 85721
W. David Laird, Librarian
(602) 626-2101

Arizona State University Library
Tempe, Arizona 85281
Donald Riggs, Libn.
(602) 965-3417

Boston Public Library
Copley Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02117
Philip J. McNiff, Librarian
(617) 536-5400

Boston University Library
Boston, Massachusetts 02215
John Laucus, Director
(617) 353-3710

Brigham Young University Library
324 Lee Library
Provo, Utah 84602
Sterling J. Albrecht, Univ. Libn.
(801) 378-2905

University of British Columbia Library
Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6T 1W5
Doug McInnes, Acting Librarian
(604) 228-2298

Brown University Library
Providence, Rhode Island 02912
Lawrence J. Kipp, Library Consultant
(401) 863-2162

University of California Library, Berkeley
Berkeley, California 94720
Joseph Rosenthal, Director
(415) 642-3773

University of California Library, Davis
Davis, California 95616
Bernard Kreissman, Librarian
(916) 752-2110

University of California, Irvine
The University Library
P.O. Box 19557
Irvine, California 92713
Calvin J. Boyer, University Librarian
(714) 833-5212

University of California Library, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California 90024
Russell Shank, Librarian
(213) 825-1201

University of California Library, Riverside
P.O. Box 5900
Riverside, California 92507
Joan Chambers, University Librarian
(714) 787-3221

University of California, San Diego
The University Library
La Jolla, California 92037
Millicent D. Abell, Librarian
(714) 452-3061

University of California, Santa Barbara
The University Library
Santa Barbara, California 93106
Allen B. Veaner, Librarian
(805) 961-3256

Case Western Reserve University Libraries
Cleveland, Ohio 44106
James V. Jones, Director
(216) 368-2990

Center for Research Libraries
5721 Cottage Grove Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Donald B. Simpson, Director
(312) 955-4545

University of Chicago Library
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Martin D. Runkle, Director
(312) 753-2933

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221
Charles B. Osburn, Vice Provost
for Univ. Libraries
(513) 475-2218

University of Colorado Library
Boulder, Colorado 80309
Clyde Walton, Director
(303) 492-7511

Colorado State University Library
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521
Le Moyne W. Anderson, Director
(303) 491-5911

Columbia University Libraries
New York, New York 10027
Patricia Battin, Vice Pres.
& Univ. Libn.
(212) 280-2247

University of Connecticut Library
Storrs, Connecticut 06268
John P. McDonald, Director
(203) 486-2219

Cornell University Libraries
Ithaca, New York 14850
Louis E. Martin, Univ. Libn.
(607) 256-3689

Dartmouth College Libraries
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755
Margaret A. Otto, Libn.
(603) 646-2235

Duke University Libraries
Durham, North Carolina 27706
Elvin E. Strowd, Act. Univ. Librn.
(919) 684-2034

Emory University Library
Atlanta, Georgia 30322
Herbert F. Johnson, Director
(404) 329-6861

University of Florida Libraries
Gainesville, Florida 32603
Gustave A. Harrer, Director
(904) 392-0341

Florida State University Library
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
Charles E. Miller, Director
(904) 644-5211

Georgetown University Library
Washington, D.C. 20007
Joseph E. Jeffs, Director
(202) 625-4095

University of Georgia Libraries
Athens, Georgia 30601
David Bishop, Director
(404) 542-2716

University of Guelph Library
Guelph, Ontario, Canada N1G 2W1
Margaret Beckman, Chief Libn.
(519) 824-4120

Harvard University Library
Wadsworth House
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
Oscar Handlin, Director
(617) 495-2401

University of Hawaii Library
2550 The Mall
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
Don L. Bosseau, Director
(808) 948-7205

University of Houston Libraries
Houston, Texas 77004
Robin Downes, Director
(713) 749-4241

Howard University Libraries
Washington, D.C. 20001
Binford H. Conley, Director
(202) 636-7234

University of Illinois Library
1408 West Gregory Drive
Urbana, Illinois 61801
Hugh C. Atkinson, Univ. Librarian
(217) 333-0790

Indiana University Libraries
Bloomington, Indiana 47401
Elaine F. Sloan, Dean of Univ. Librs.
(812) 337-3404

University of Iowa Libraries
Iowa City, Iowa 52240
Leslie W. Dunlap, Dean of Lib. Admin.
(319) 353-4450

Iowa State University Library
Ames, Iowa 50011
Warren B. Kuhn, Dean of Lib. Services
(515) 294-1442

John Crerar Library
35 West 33rd Street
Chicago, Illinois 60616
William S. Budington, Director
(312) 225-2526

Johns Hopkins University Library
The Milton S. Eisenhower Library
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
Susan K. Martin, Libn.
(301) 338-8325

University of Kansas Library
Lawrence, Kansas 66044
James Ranz, Dean of Libraries
(913) 864-3601

University of Kentucky Libraries
Lexington, Kentucky 40506
Paul A. Willis, Director
(606) 257-3801

Kent State University Libraries
Kent, Ohio 44242
Hyman W. Kritzer, Assistant Provost &
Director of Libraries
(216) 672-2962

Library of Congress
Washington, D.C. 20540
Daniel J. Boorstin, Librarian
(202) 287-5205

Linda Hall Library
Kansas City, Missouri 64110
Thomas D. Gillies, Director
(816) 363-4600

Louisiana State University Library
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803
George Guidry, Jr., Director
(504) 388-2217

McGill University Library
3459 McTavish Street
Montreal, Canada H3A 1Y1
Marianne Scott, Director
(514) 392-4949

McMaster University Library
1280 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada L8S 4L6
Graham R. Hill, University Librarian
(416) 525-9140 Local 4359

The University of Manitoba Libraries
Winnipeg, Manitoba R3T 2N2
Canada
Marilyn J. Sharrow, Director
(204) 474-9881

University of Maryland Library
College Park, Maryland 20742
H. Joanne Harrar, Librarian
(301) 454-3011

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002
Richard J. Talbot, Director
(413) 545-0284

Massachusetts Inst. of Technology Libs.
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
Jay K. Lucker, Director
(617) 253-5651

University of Miami Library
P.O. Box 248214
Coral Gables, Florida 33124
Frank Rodgers, Director
(305) 284-3551

University of Michigan Library
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109
Richard M. Dougherty, Director
(313) 764-9356

Michigan State University Library
East Lansing, Michigan 48823
Richard E. Chapin, Director
(517) 355-2341

University of Minnesota Libraries
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Eldred Smith, Director
(612) 373-3097

University of Missouri Library
Columbia, Missouri 65201
John Gribbin, Director
(314) 882-4701

National Agricultural Library
Beltsville, Maryland 20705
Richard A. Farley, Director
(301) 344-4248

National Library of Canada
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ont., Canada K1A 0N4
Joseph Guy Sylvestre, Librarian
(613) 996-1623

National Library of Medicine
Bethesda, Maryland 20014
Martin M. Cummings, Director
(301) 496-6221

University of Nebraska-Lincoln
The University Libraries
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0410
Gerald A. Rudolph, Dean of Libraries
(402) 472-7211

The Newberry Library
60 West Walton Street
Chicago, Illinois 60610
Joel L. Samuels, Dir. of Lib. Sers.
(312) 943-9090

The University of New Mexico
General Library
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131
Paul Vassallo, Dean of Lib. Sers.
(505) 277-4241

New York Public Library
Fifth Avenue at 42nd Street
New York, New York 10018
David H. Stam, Director of the
Research Libraries
(212) 930-0800

New York State Library
Cultural Education Center
Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12234
Joseph F. Shubert, State Librarian
(518) 474-5930

New York University Libraries
New York, New York 10003
Carlton C. Rochell, Dean of Libraries
(212) 598-7676

University of North Carolina Libraries
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27515
James F. Govan, Director
(919) 962-1301

Northwestern University Libraries
Evanston, Illinois 60211
John P. McGowan, Librarian
(312) 492-7640

University of Notre Dame Libraries
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556
Robert C. Miller, Librarian
(219) 283-5252

Ohio State University Libraries
Columbus, Ohio 43210
William J. Studer, Director
(614) 422-4241

University of Oklahoma Library
Norman, Oklahoma 73069
Sul H. Lee, Dean, University Libs.
(405) 325-2611 or 2614

Oklahoma State University Library
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078
Roscoe Rouse, Dean of Lib. Ser.
(405) 624-6321

University of Oregon Library
Eugene, Oregon 97403
George W. Shipman, Univ. Libn.
(503) 686-3056

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104
Richard De Gennaro, Director
(215) 243-7091

Pennsylvania State University Library
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802
Stuart Forth, Dean of Univ. Libraries
(814) 865-0401

University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260
Glenora Edwards Rossell, Director
(412) 624-4401

Princeton University Library
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
Donald Koepp, Director
(609) 452-3170

Purdue University Library
Lafayette, Indiana 47907
Joseph M. Dagnese, Director
(317) 494-2900

Queen's University
Douglas Library
Kingston, Canada K7L 5C4
Margct B. McBurney, Chief Libn.
(613) 547-5950

Rice University Library
6100 S. Main, Box 1892
Houston, Texas 77001
Samuel Carrington, Director
(713) 527-4022

University of Rochester Libraries
Rochester, New York 14627
James F. Wyatt, Director
(716) 275-4463

Rutgers University Library
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901
Hendrik Edelman, Univ. Libn.
(201) 932-7505

University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, Canada S7N OWO
Nancy A. Brown, Univ. Libn.
and Director of Libraries
(306) 343-4216

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Constitution Avenue at 10th St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20560
Robert Maloy, Director
(202) 357-3337

University of South Carolina Libraries
Columbia, South Carolina 29208
Kenneth E. Toombs, Director of Libs.
(803) 777-3142

University of Southern California Library
Los Angeles, California 90007
Roy L. Kidman, Librarian
(213) 743-2543

Southern Illinois University Library
Carbondale, Illinois 62901
Kenneth G. Peterson, Dean of
Library Affairs
(618) 453-2522

Stanford University Libraries
Stanford, California 94305
David C. Weber, Director
(415) 497-2016

State University of New York at Albany
Libraries
1400 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12222
Joseph Z. Nitecki, Director
(518) 457-8540

State University of New York at Buffalo
Libraries
Buffalo, New York 14214
Saktidas Roy, Director
(716) 636-2965

State University of New York at Stony Brook
Library
Stony Brook, New York 11794
John B. Smith, Director & Dean of Lib.
(516) 246-5650

Syracuse University Libraries
Syracuse, New York 13210
Donald C. Anthony, Director
(315) 423-2574

Temple University Library
Paley Library
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122
Joseph A. Boisse, Director
(215) 787-8231

University of Tennessee Libraries
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
Donald R. Hunt, Director
(615) 974-4127

University of Texas Libraries
Austin, Texas 78712
Harold W. Billings, Director
(512) 471-3811

Texas A&M University Library
College Station, Texas 77843
Irene B. Hoadley, Director
(713) 845-8111

University of Toronto Libraries
Toronto, Ont., Canada M5S 1A5
Robert Blackburn, Director
(416) 978-2292

Tulane University Library
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118
William Newman, Director
(504) 865-5131

University of Utah Libraries
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
Roger K. Hanson, Director
(801) 581-8558

Vanderbilt University Library
419 21st Avenue South
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
Frank P. Grisham, Director
(615) 322-2834

Virginia Polytechnic Inst. and State Univ.
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
H. Gordon Bechanan, Director of Libs.
(703) 961-5593

University of Virginia
Alderman Library
Charlottesville, Virginia 22901
Ray Frantz, Jr., Librarian
(804) 924-3026 or 7849

University of Washington Library
Seattle, Washington 98195
Merle N. Boylan, Director
(206) 543-1760

Washington State University Library
Pullman, Washington 99163
Allene F. Schnaitter, Director
(509) 335-4557

Washington University Libraries
St. Louis, Missouri 63130
Charles Churchwell, Librarian
(314) 889-5400

Wayne State University Libraries
Detroit, Michigan 48202
Vern M. Pings, Director
(313) 577-4020

University of Western Ontario Libraries
London 72, Canada
Robert Lee, Director of Libs.
(519) 679-3165

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
Joseph H. Treyz, Jr., Director
(608) 262-3521

Yale University Libraries
New Haven, Connecticut 06520
Rutherford D. Rogers, Librarian
(203) 436-2456

York University Libraries
4700 Keele Street
Downsview, Ontario, Canada M3J 2R2
Anne Woodsworth, Director
(416) 667-2235